DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 219 IR 007 882

TITLE Oversight Hearing on Federal Library Programs. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education and the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on the Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Sixth Congress, First Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 3 Apr 79

NOTE 79p.; Best copy available; page 58 to end will not reproduce

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Instructional Materials Centers; Libraries; *Library Education; *Library Programs; *Library Services

ABSTRACT

This publication details the proceedings of an oversight hearing on federal library programs which focused on those programs that (1) make federal funds available to school districts to purchase instructional materials and school library resources, (2) authorize funds for the support of college and university libraries and for the improvement of library training programs at this level, and (3) provide federal aid to establish and improve public library services and outreach. Included are statements and testimony by library directors, library school deans and professors, library association presidents, instructional media coordinators, and others. Copies of supplemental materials are also provided, including newspaper articles, newsletters, library publications, letters, survey data, and biographical data about students receiving fellowships for library education. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON FEDERAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON

APRIL 3, 1979

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
44-917 O WASHINGTON : 1979

ED179219
IR007882
IR
2

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
GEORGE MILLER, California
MICHAEL O. MYERS, Pennsylvania
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
EDWARD J. STACK, Florida
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
DON BAILEY, Pennsylvania

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
DANIEL B. CRANE, Illinois
JON HINSON, Mississippi
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MICHAEL O. MYERS, Pennsylvania
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
DANIEL B. CRANE, Illinois
JON HINSON, Mississippi
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio, *Ex Officio*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky,
Ex Officio

JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
Ex Officio

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on April 3, 1979	1
Statement of—	
Bedford, Louise C., instructional media coordinator, Montgomery County Board of Education, Mount Sterling, Ky	13
Boisse, Joseph A., director, Library/Learning Center, University of Wisconsin, Parkside, Wis	31
Childers, Thomas, associate professor, School of Library and Information Science, Drexel University	43
Johnston, James R., director, Joliet Public Library, Joliet, Ill	28
Ladof, Nina Sydney, director, Camden County Library, Voorhees, N.J	19
Shank, Russell, president, American Library Association and director of Libraries, University of California, Los Angeles Campus	2
Vance, Kenneth E., professor and assistant dean, School of Library Science, University of Michigan in Ann Arbor	33
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera—	
American Library Association, Chicago, Ill., publication entitled "A Perspective on Libraries"	58
Bedford, Louise C., instructional media coordinator, Montgomery County Board of Education, Mount Sterling, Ky., statement of	15
Childers, Thomas, associate professor, School of Library and Information Science, Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pa., testimony of	45
Ford, Hon. William D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, memorandum re: Background information for oversight hearing on Federal library programs, dated March 30, 1979	56
Johnston, James R., chief librarian, Joliet Public Library, Joliet, Ill.:	
Letter to Hon. George M. O'Brien, dated May 16, 1978	30
Statement of	29
Ladof, Nina Sydney, director, Camden County Library, Voorhees, N.J.:	
Newspaper articles submitted by:	
Film Lovers, Take Note: Echelon Library Has 1,000	22
Library "Storytellers" Bring 30 Handicapped Students Joy	21
Their Faces Portray Rich, Simple Lives	23
Statement of	25
Shank, Russell, president, American Library Association and Director of Libraries, University of California, Los Angeles Campus, Information 13 Newsletter, submitted by	7
Vance, Kenneth E., professor and assistant dean, School of Library Science, University of Michigan in Ann Arbor:	
Appendix A	37
Appendix B	39
Appendix C	43

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON FEDERAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1979

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building. Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education) and Hon. William D. Ford (chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Ford, Peyser, Hawkins, Crane, Erdahl, Edwards, Tauke, Murphy, and Kildee.

Chairman PERKINS. We have a quorum present. We have a member on this side of the committee.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education and the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education are conducting a joint oversight hearing today on several programs providing Federal aid to school, college, and public libraries.

The first program, title IV–B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, makes funds available to school districts to purchase instructional materials and school library resources. The Education Amendments of 1978 extended this program through fiscal year 1983; this legislation also contains an amendment which removes guidance, counseling, and testing from title IV–B and places these activities in a new, separate category, title IV–D.

For fiscal year 1979, $180 million was appropriated for title IV–B. However, the Administration is requesting that $18 million of this money be diverted to the new title IV–D, leaving $162 million for library and instructional resources. For fiscal year 1980 the President is recommending $149.6 million for IV–B, a cutback of $12.4 million.

We will also be hearing testimony on several programs for libraries at the postsecondary level contained in title II of the Higher Education Act. This title authorizes funds for the support of college and university libraries and to improve library training programs at this level.

Oversight of these programs is especially timely since the Higher Education Act expires at the end of this fiscal year. In addition, the President's budget proposes eliminating funds for all title II programs except for title II–C, for which level funding of $6 million is recommended.

The third set of programs is contained in the Library Services and Construction Act and provides Federal aid to establish and improve public library services and outreach. The President's budget would also cut back this program, from $67.5 million in fiscal year 1979 to $60.2 million in fiscal year 1980.

We have a panel of witnesses this morning: Russell Shank, president, American Library Association, and director of libraries, UCLA; Louise C. Bedford, instructional media coordinator, Montgomery County Board of Education, Mount Sterling, Ky.; Nina S. Ladof, director, Camden County Library, Voorhees, N.J.; Carol Moss, director, Los Angeles County Public Library System; James R. Johnston, director, Joliet Public Library, Joliet, Ill.; and Joseph A. Boisse, director of libraries, University of Wisconsin, Parkside.

Will the whole panel come around and we will hear from you first, Mr. Shank.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL SHANK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, AND DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS; LOUISE C. BEDFORD, INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA COORDINATOR, MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, MOUNT STERLING, KY.; NINA S. LADOF, DIRECTOR, CAMDEN COUNTY LIBRARY, VOORHEES, N.J.; JAMES R. JOHNSTON, DIRECTOR, JOLIET PUBLIC LIBRARY, JOLIET, ILL.; AND JOSEPH A. BOISSE, DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, PARKSIDE, A PANEL

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL SHANK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, AND DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS

Mr. SHANK. Thank you. My name is Russell Shank. I am university librarian and professor at UCLA and president of the ALA this year. I have only recently gone to UCLA, having spent 10 years prior to that at the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington, for which you may be doubly blessed. I should know how to treat Congress; not being in Washington, I probably treat you very well.

This year as president of the ALA I have devoted myself to taking a message around the country as to the social consequences of good library services rather than to argue what would happen should our libraries and library services fail. In this I hope I can stir those who would prefer to have the good services.

The message is principally, in philosophical terms, one of noting that the American concept of the public library is that it should be a utility for all citizens to provide an informed citizenry for the survival of the American democracy. But I could go on that in this information age it is more important than ever to have a publicly accessible source of information for citizens who otherwise would not know indeed how to survive in American society. It becomes a matter, then, of people going someplace where they can keep from getting lost as well as a place where they can find things.

The Federal Government has been exceedingly important in the past in assisting libraries, throughout the country, providing seed money, providing impetus for new programs, tests, education, new buildings that would otherwise be beyond the means of local libraries but leaving the planning and the offering of library service to the local library where the action is.

I think this is appropriate. I think the Federal Government has had and still has a very strong role. The people who are here with me can speak more eloquently than I in the areas in which they are concerned. And I will soon turn the panel over to them.

Having the floor, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the liberty of introducing a few comments about the effects of proposition 13 in California.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. SHANK. Thank you. Proposition 13 would not be the same kind of event that I think would occur elsewhere in the country b[illegible] as I am sure we are all aware, it is a harbinger of fiscal conse[illegible]atism. Mr. Jarvis and Mr. Gann are not done with their campaigning.

Having reduced real estate taxes by 67 percent in the State of California, one of them is now ready to ask the Californians to vote to eliminate the personal income tax; the other is ready to ask Californians to vote to limit State spending. All told, this will be a severe strain on public utilities in California, and I worry lest it set an example for the Nation.

Only 8 percent of public library income for fiscal year 1978–79 is from State sources, including the surplus we got in California. Only 9 percent is Federal sources——

Chairman PERKINS. Let me interrupt you a second. We have an outstanding member in this Congress who is on this committee and who comes from your great city. That is Gus Hawkins. And I know that he may want to say a word at this time. I recognize Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regret being late and I do no[illegible]nt to interrupt Mr. Shank, as he was making a statement as I came in, with which I thoroughly agree. As one of the few Representatives of the State who openly opposed proposition 13 at somewhat political peril in my own area, I quite agree with him and share the great concern that some of us must have, invariably have, because of the impact of proposition 13.

I think that the calamity that it will bring about has not really completely been felt as yet. I fear the years ahead when the so-called relief money that is forthcoming from the State will not be forthcoming. And I suspect that it will be after the next election that we will suffer tremendously.

I have made a special object of being present here this morning to hear the testimony on this, on the specific ways in which the State is being harmed. I hope that through what we do we may perhaps save some of the other States and the Nation.

It is very difficult, at the present time, to face the problem specifically because if the State itself does not take action to relieve the situation at this session of the legislature, I fear that those of us at the Federal level will be unable to say to the rest of the Nation that California is engaged

in the maintenance of efforts of its own, and for that reason, may not be able to get the relief money in order to relieve this situation.

Thank you for this opportunity to at least recognize Mr. Shank and the other members of the panel, and I certainly look forward to the testimony.

Chairman PERKINS. Iam going to call on Mr. Ford, the co-chairman of this meeting today. Mr. Ford is the chairman of the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, has been very active, and is the author of much of the legislation. I know he has a few comments that he would like to make concerning libraries, and I will not interrupt any more after that. Go ahead.

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I first want to thank you for convening this joint meeting with your subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education which I chair.

Mr. Chairman, it is an unpleasant task that you have set out for us today. We are being forced to take a hard and realistic look at the programs that virtually all of us on this committee have supported for many years and determine what their practical chance of survival in the budget process.

The outlook is less than optimistic. It is ironic that while the President has proclaimed this as National Library Week, his budget has called for a $12.4 million cutback in title III, elimination of the funding for all programs except II–C in the Higher Education Act, which is recommended at the fiscal year 1979 level, and a cutback of $7.3 million for the Library Services and Construction Act.

It would be my inclination to provide for healthy increases in all of these worthwhile programs. And I am sure that you and I are in complete agreement on that. They have proven to be very significant to the libraries which receive them and, more particularly, the people who have come to depend on them.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education I know that 2,536 of our colleges received only $3,963 under title II–A last year but it clearly has nevertheless been a vital source of funding which, in the recent years of severe belt-tightening on the part of our institutions, has meant the difference in whether some school libraries could make any new acquisitions whatsoever.

It's difficult to believe at a time when we double the amount of accumulated knowledge available to mankind in a matter of months rather than generations, that a couple of thousand dollars makes the difference between whether an institution of higher education makes any new acquisitions or not during the course of a year.

If one were to read about this in science fiction, one would not believe our society could come to this state no matter how bad things got.

These budget proposals come at a time when all types of libraries during recent years have faced a decline both in actual budget dollars and in the purchasing power of the funds they receive. Libraries are in no way insulated from the impact of inflation. As a matter of fact, in some ways libraries experience more severe impact from inflation than do normal governmental activities and quasi-governmental activities.

There already have been cuts in hours of service, book purchases, periodicals, and other library materials. According to figures supplied

by the American Library Association, during the past 5 years the average book price has risen 43 percent, to $20.10, while the average periodical subscription has climbed 56 percent, to $27.58.

I might say parenthetically that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee soon will mark up a bill which will deal specifically with these two items and a possible continuance of postal subsidies with regard to materials traveling to and from libraries, as well as stretching out the new rate increases for periodicals.

We have found that the increases which will be triggered by the law—if we are not able to change it—are passed on directly to the libraries and become an additional cost of operation. This is what I was referring to when I said that the inflationary impact on libraries is greater than it is on other institutions, because we have a whole array of increased costs coming to libraries through other governmental functions.

The present budgetary situation has placed a special burden on libraries seeking to serve special populations—the disadvantaged, the elderly, the handicapped and those who are linguistically different. No longer are funds available to acquire the materials these special populations need.

To put the library budget picture more in perspective, I would like to point out that in fiscal year 1973, before the consolidation took place school libraries received a total of $200 million—that is $100 million from the former title II of ESEA and $50 million which was matched with another $50 million from NDEA, title III.

In my view, it is unconscionable to contemplate that we could now sit back and permit libraries to receive only $149 million under comparable programs just 7 years later, when there was a clear understanding by the administration and this committee at the time the consolidation compromise was reached, that there would not be a reduction in any of the component parts consolidated into the new title.

Clearly, those of us who are still in the Congress and participated in that process have an obligation to uphold the word not only of those who agreed with us, but also those who did not agree with us but nevertheless did compromise with us.

I hope that you and I, Mr. Chairman, can work together to impress upon the Administration, particularly the Office of Management and Budget, the fact that this was a commitment made to the American people that is now due and payable.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, again for giving me this chance.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Crane, do you want to say anything?

Mr. CRANE. No, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. I just briefly would say, Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the hearings this morning because of my interest in libraries. I would just say at a time of rising costs for our libraries they are as much a victim of inflation as any other element in our society and in some ways more.

At a time of rising costs the Federal Government has to recognize its role in helping the libraries serve the public by its method of funding the libraries. I would hope we could prevail upon the Appropriations Committee to recognize this need.

44-917 O - 79 - 2

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you. I want to agree with my colleagues Mr. Kildee and Chairman Ford. As a sponsor back in 1959 in the Pennsylvania Statehouse of our State Library Act, I have been most concerned since then and very appreciative of the Federal aid.

I feel, as Chairman Ford does, that unless we assist the Appropriations Committee in joining us in increasing aid to keep up with the terrible costs, many of our small libraries and community library centers are going to collapse. I know that is so in my district. And I think we are doing the right thing this morning and should urge the Appropriations Committee to do likewise.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. Go ahead.

Mr. SHANK. Thank you. I will be brief so my colleagues will have a chance to make their statements. I was particularly interested to hear Congressman Hawkins' comments. Proposition 13 in California was not a demand to do away with services; it was a call for relief from exorbitant real estate taxes, which for my people equaled more per month than their social security checks.

I will read one statement on the effect of proposition 13 in California and turn the whole statement, if it is your pleasure, over to the clerk.

"The citizens of California now have 10,877 fewer hours weekly of public library service available to them after proposition 13, a 22-percent reduction, and will have to be satisfied with a 20-percent reduction in funds for new materials—back to the 1975 level—at a time of soaring book prices.

"The Los Angeles County Library has not added one new book since July first of last year. With this has come a 21-percent reduction in staffing and an actual loss of jobs through layoffs for 1,228 public library employees. This does not count the many displacements"—for example, as on our own campus, where I was forced to reduce student employment by 88,000 hours per year.

"Interlibrary activity among State libraries declined 50 percent, and special programing for children and adults and visits to hospitals and shut-ins were eliminated in many libraries and this after only 8 months of proposition 13."

[A document entitled "Information 13 Newsletter" follows:]

13 INFORMATION NEWSLETTER

Timely information on the impact on library services of Proposition 13 implementation

Final Issue

No. 11, December 15, 1978

With this issue we write "30" to the 13 Information Newsletter. Begun on June 16 as an immediate response by the State Library to share information on what was happening among California's public libraries as a result of reductions caused by passage of Proposition 13, the newsletter has appeared 10 times to date and is terminated with this issue summarizing the results of a special survey.

When the electorate passed Proposition 13, the Jarvis-Gann Tax Limitation Initiative, on June 6, 1978, they, no doubt unwittingly, wrought havoc upon the state's public library service.

Public library finance in California has been based largely upon local taxes on real property. Proposition 13 brought a 62% reduction in this income. The reductions in public library service capability have varied widely based on the type of library, the local jurisdiction's reliance on the property tax and specific local governing bodies' perception of local priorities.

While reductions in overall revenues of more than 60% have been reported, most libraries did not suffer the full effects of Proposition 13 cutbacks in fiscal year 1978-79. The Governor and the Legislature, in a prompt and laudable response following June 6, distributed some $4 billion of state surplus funds to hard-hit local governments. Effects of this assistance are difficult to accurately assess and its impact varied, but very little of the money found its way to local public libraries.

Only 8% of public library income for fiscal year 1978-79 is from state sources (including the surplus), while 9% is from federal sources. The federal contribution is 42% revenue sharing, 36% Public Works Employment Act, 16% Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and 6% other sources.

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY Library Development Services Bureau
P. O. Box 2037 Sacramento CA 95809 Tel. (916) 445-4730 TWX 910 367-3553

Statewide, total public library income for operating purposes this year stands at 83% of last year, and 11% of the total comes from reserves, carryover and prior year taxes. Indications are that next year will be as bad, and without some new financial base fiscal year 1980-81 will be the worst of all for public libraries as they exhaust their reserves and relief from state surplus and fall ever farther behind in the contest with inflation and rising costs.

In July and August 1978, libraries closed down branches and bookmobiles, cut hours of opening, laid off staff temporarily or permanently, and halted the purchase of new books and other materials as an immediate way of cutting expenditures. As the funding picture cleared in varying degrees in each jurisdiction, a few libraries had to settle in and live with their cuts, most were able to restore many of their services, and a fortunate few received modest increases for the current budget year.

In September, the California State Library and the California Library Association co-sponsored a special survey of public libraries to determine the effects of Proposition 13. The data summarized on the last three pages of this newsletter are taken from that survey, and thanks are due to the 181 of our 171 public libraries who took time from their hectic days to complete it. (All large libraries and major population centers are included.)

Library service is notably cut back this year for 18 million of the state's population, served by 113 public libraries. For four and a half million served by 28 libraries it stands at less than 70% of last year's level.

The citizens of California now have 10,877 fewer hours weekly of public library service available to them, a 12% reduction, and will have to be satisfied with a 20% reduction in funds for new materials, back to the 1975 level in a time of soaring book prices. With this has come a 21% reduction in staffing (full-time equivalent), and an actual loss of jobs through lay off for 1,228 public library employees. Interlibrary loan activity among the state's libraries declined by 50%, and special programming for children and adults and outreach visits to hospitals and shut-ins were decreased or eliminated in many libraries.

In the survey a few libraries indicated they anticipate additional state relief funds this year, and their current budgets are not in balance. If additional funding is not forthcoming for them in early 1979 they will have to make further cuts in service. As used in the survey, the distinction between county libraries and district libraries is the traditional one set forth in the Education Code; county libraries are not here considered as special districts. A distinction is made between county libraries primarily on the property tax and those on the general fund, to show the differences in income resulting.

Section 19100 of the Education Code reads: "The Legislature hereby declares that it is in the interest of the people and of the state that there be a general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence through the

establishment and operation of public libraries. Such diffusion is a matter of general concern inasmuch as it is the duty of the state to provide encouragement to the voluntary lifelong learning of the people of the state.

"The Legislature further declares that the public library is a supplement to the formal system of free public education, and a source of information and inspiration to persons of all ages, and a resource for continuing education and reeducation beyond the years of formal education, and as such deserves adequate financial support from government at all levels."

In the California Library Services Act (Education Code sec. 18701), designed to coordinate local resources and provide a start toward equalizing services, "The Legislature finds and declares that it is in the interest of the people of the state to insure that all people have free and convenient access to all library resources and services that might enrich their lives, regardless of where they live or of the tax base of their local government."

Local public library service, unequal before, was made even more unequal by passage of Proposition 13. This development of greater inequities in service levels available to citizens is a matter of great concern. Reported reductions in library service are almost totally related to the library's reliance on the property tax without any reflection of need or citizen desire for service. It is evident that unless some permanent remedial action is taken to place public library service on a firm financial basis, the general decline started by Proposition 13 this year will continue, and the disparity in the level of library service available to citizens in various areas of the state will increase.

The people of California need library service. Our libraries stand ready to provide it. There remains only to find a way to pay the bill.

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY / CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Special Survey of Public Libraries, September 1978

Statewide summary

Page 1: Proposition 13 impact

Total library operating income, percentage for 1978-79 of 1977-78 level, by number of libraries reporting and population served.

Public libraries statewide, by type of jurisdiction: total 171	Less than 70%	70% to 85%	86% to 100%	Over 100%
City libraries (80 of 106 reporting)	13 libs. 701,570 pop.	20 libs. 1,632,735 pop.	31 libs. 5,741,800 pop.	16 libs. 1,332,840 pop.
County libraries on property tax (31 of 33 reporting)	10 libs. 3,611,235 pop.	10 libs. 2,853,420 pop.	6 libs. 1,114,620 pop.	5 libs. 1,219,755 pop.
County libraries on general fund (10 of 11 reporting)	-0-	1 lib. 46,700 pop.	3 libs. 65,500 pop.	6 libs. 277,510 pop.
Combination city-county libraries (8 of 8 reporting)	1 lib. 85,300 pop.	5 libs. 1,317,195 pop.	2 libs. 616,510 pop.	-0-
District libraries (12 of 13 reporting)	4 libs. 157,800 pop.	3 libs. 85,950 pop.	4 libs. 81,000 pop.	1 lib. 16,750 pop.
State total (141 of 171 reporting)	28 libs. 4,555,905 pop.	39 libs. 5,936,000 pop.	46 libs. 7,619,430 pop.	28 libs. 2,849,855 pop.

10

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY / CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Special Survey of Public Libraries, September 1978

Statewide summary

Page 2: Operating income

Public libraries statewide, by type of jurisdiction	Property tax, secured		Property tax, unsecured & state reimbursement		Reserves, carryover, prior year taxes		General fund, other	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
City libraries	34,698,226	16,514,394	2,474,638	1,149,976	1,919,991	3,044,442	44,646,057	53,263,353
County libraries on property tax	60,253,362	27,512,397	9,990,731	5,630,491	8,358,339	12,481,943	3,773,615	3,568,471
County libraries on general fund	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	7,353	23,912	2,270,979	2,195,226
Combination city-county libraries	9,922,167	5,152,803	1,385,339	410,559	1,262,035	1,673,824	4,738,412	5,557,639
District libraries	4,378,812	1,874,328	692,679	169,120	1,431,613	1,527,158	226,423	186,670
State total	109,251,567	51,053,922	14,543,387	7,360,146	12,999,331	18,951,279	55,655,686	64,791,359

Public libraries statewide, by type of jurisdiction	Subtotal, all local income		Subtotal, all state income		Subtotal, all federal income		Total operating income, all sources	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
City libraries	84,038,141	74,581,678	16,327	1,084,325	12,545,496	11,476,524	96,599,964	87,142,527
County libraries on property tax	82,375,258	49,352,392	6,909	10,580,477[2]	1,450,955	3,627,597	83,833,120	63,560,466
County libraries on general fund	2,278,377	2,319,138	-0-	3,200	77,912	157,154	2,356,289	2,379,492
Combination city-county libraries	17,269,952	13,020,534	-0-	1,287,022	248,858	181,608	17,536,810	14,489,164
District libraries	6,747,000	3,758,526	-0-	565,432	50,000	43,600	6,797,000	4,367,558
State total	192,728,726	142,832,268	23,236	13,520,456[3]	14,373,221	15,486,483	207,125,183	171,939,207

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY December 1978

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY / CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Special Survey of Public Libraries, September 1978

Statewide summary — Page 3: Expenditure, hours, staffing

Public libraries statewide, by type of jurisdiction	Library materials: books, periodicals, microform, audiovisual		Total operating expenditure		Hours open per week, main library only		Total hours open per week, all service outlets	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
City libraries	13,027,204	12,434,646	88,910,033	83,753,164	5,037	4,324	18,057	14,414
County libraries on property tax	10,640,149	6,637,369	76,307,666	62,835,920	1,638	1,225	22,678	17,421
County libraries on general fund	336,965	391,237	2,263,936	2,336,776	619	586	1,775	1,665
Combination city-county libraries	3,465,607	1,777,672	15,711,169	13,746,000	535	403	4,706	3,407
District libraries	731,375	484,885	5,124,230	3,859,686	746	509	1,041	653
State total	27,201,300	21,726,009	188,317,034	166,521,546	8,575	7,047	48,457	37,560

Public libraries statewide, by type of jurisdiction	Total staff FTE 1977-78	Total staff FTE 1978-79	Change	Count of persons laid off (not FTE) 1978-79
City libraries	4,372.34	3,709.73	-662.61	396
County libraries on property tax	3,509.61	2,631.68	-877.93	434
County libraries on general fund	153.03	137.07	-15.96	6
Combination city-county libraries	743.85	541.18	-202.67	368
District libraries	281.08	134.78	-146.3	104
State total	9,059.91	7,154.44	-1,905.47	1,228

Notes:

1. Del Norte County District Library is newly formed and not typical of other district libraries. It anticipates most income from timber yield tax.

2. Includes amounts libraries anticipate receiving as additional state relief: Marin Co.(unspecified); Santa Clara Co. ($1,329,587).

3. Los Angeles Co. anticipates possible additional state income of $11,904,368, not included in totals, of which $2,424,000 is for materials.

4. Main increase is revenue sharing and PWEA.

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY December 1978

Mr. SHANK. The final part of my statement is merely to reemphasize again that our desire is that library services and provision of information to citizens be included as among the highest order of services that communities and governments can offer to their people and that library services should not be considered a luxury and subject to the same cuts that one will find in municipal golf courses, chambers of commerce and fireworks, as has happened in California.

It would seem to me incredible that a Nation which is a leader in the world of information and communications and technology could not fund a public utility for its citizens to have access to the same information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to ask my colleagues to speak and, roughly speaking, in the order in which you called them. One exception is Carol Moss, of the Los Angeles County Public Library System. She is not here and sends her apologies. Bad weather on the way forced cancellation of her plane reservations and tomorrow morning she must host a public event for the citizens of Los Angeles County, which, I am sure, she feels will be very important to her in raising funds for the county library.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you. Our next witness is Ms. Bedford but before you begin testifying I want to mention to everyone here that Congress amended title IV–B last year, based on your testimony before this committee. You told us some title IV–B funds were not being used for their intended purpose, so we amended the program to require that the funds be used only for books and equipment for instructional purposes. I thought I ought to make that statement before Ms. Bedford commences. Go ahead, Ms. Bedford.

STATEMENT OF LOUISE C. BEDFORD, INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA COORDINATOR, MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, MOUNT STERLING, KY.

Ms. BEDFORD. Thank you. My name is Louise C. Bedford. I am the instructional media coordinator for the Montgomery County Board of Education, which is located with headquarters at Mount Sterling, Ky.

I testified before and I would like to say at the beginning that we were very pleased with the guidelines that you did include in the changing of the law. I think it has had a good effect. We are getting more actual good for boys and girls and materials going out onto the shelves in school media centers because of those guidelines.

We were very happy with the fact that our guidance and counseling were removed into a separate section of IV–D. We were not so happy when we found that there was not the funding to support IV–D.

I have submitted a written statement that had attached to it a list of projects that are being carried out through IV–B funds in the Commonwealth of Kentucky at the present time. Even more than reading my written statement I would be very happy if you would read carefully the project reports. These are projects that were taken at random across the face of Kentucky. There is nothing dressed up or fancy about them. They are written in the language of just plain, ordinary

people out in the field who are doing the best they can with what they have to work with.

I think, as you read those projects, you are going to realize more fully perhaps what the money you fund and send out there does. Just last week I had occasion to be visiting some media centers over in Madison County in the State of Kentucky; the county seat there is Richmond, Ky. It is a university town; Eastern Kentucky University is situated there.

During the day as I visited—you might be interested in hearing this—two of the librarians said to me during the course of our conversation: "Well, without IV–B we would be dead." I think that pretty well expresses the way a lot of librarians out in the field feel about this.

This particular county, to show you a little, I think, of the problem involved here, is in the central part of Kentucky. There is some industry there; it certainly should be an excellent tax structure. In the State of Kentucky we have for this present school year a minimum allowance in media of $4 per child—$2.50 for printed materials, $1.50 for nonprinted materials. Now, here was a county that really I can think of no reason that would not need State minimums but was not receiving them. When those librarians stated they would be literally dead without IV–B, they meant just that.

I felt very heartened by the remarks Mr. Ford made and you other gentlemen also. I feel we are in friendly country this morning. Possibly I don't need to be as persuasive as I thought I did. As I came to Washington yesterday I was trying to think of ways I could just talk to you this morning a minute, upon a person-to-person basis, that would make you know how important these funds are to us.

We people in the education field—and I speak of the education field in general this morning but particularly of people who are working in school libraries or media centers, whichever term you prefer—fight a steady battle, an uphill battle. And we are at a disadvantage because there is nothing very dramatic or very flamboyant about what we do. We are in the process of educating boys and girls; and that is a slow, gradual process.

However, I want to submit to you this morning that, if we turn out through the years boys and girls who cannot read well, who have not received a basic education so that they can go out in the world and be economically productive, you have a situation on your hands that is just as devastating in its way as what happened in the last few days at Three Mile Island up in Pennsylvania. The only difference is that our failures come out more slowly and they are a growth on the face of society that accumulates through the years with more and more people who are not economically viable.

I will be completing a 33d year this year, of service in this field and I have been amazed in recent years, I think, by the fact that we talk about the remedial reading programs in our schools and are willing to put money into our remedial reading programs—now, don't misunderstand me; I am not against a remedial reading program; I am for it all the way.

We take these boys and girls with a little reading ability and put them in the remedial labor classroom and, by the use of machines and

enrichment materials, we can in 9 cases out of 10 lift their reading ability level by a considerable amount.

The part that amazes me, though, is that when we put these boys and girls back into the mainstream of the school, we fail to take into account that reading is a very basic skill and, if it is not used, it rusts just as anything else and becomes unproductive again. There is only one way really that we are going to make good readers out of boys and girls so they can become well educated, and that is by having them do reading.

In the school media field, we have one advantage: that these boys and girls are a captive audience, so to speak. I don't really like the word "captive" but maybe it is the best word we can use in this particular situation. If we have materials in these school media centers that will make people want to come in there and read, they will become good readers and use those skills and be better educated boys and girls. That is what this thing is all about.

For the year of 1980 we asked for an appropriation of $197 million, and the basis of President Carter is $149 million. There is quite a discrepancy there. Now, the figure we requested was not any more than necessary to carry on the programs and what we are doing at the present time.

We are caught, as you have mentioned here, in this inflationary spiral just the same as anyone else. If we do not have the money to do these things and to buy these materials, we are going to be in a very serious bind. And at this time I submit to you that money that comes to us from local or State funds will not be sufficient to carry on the job that we need to do.

I thank you very much for listening to me and for the opportunity to be here this morning.

[Ms. Bedford's prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF LOUISE C. BEDFORD, INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA COORDINATOR, MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, MT. STERLING, KY.

My name is Louise C. Bedford. I serve as the Instructional Media Coordinator for the Montgomery County Board of Education located at Mt. Sterling, Kentucky. This board serves a county of approximately 16,000 people and a school population of 4,500 students. I will give a very brief oral testimony to supplement the written one and will be delighted to answer any of your questions that I can.

I am completing my 33rd year of work in the school media profession. During that time it has been my pleasure to serve as President of the Kentucky School Media Association. At the present time I am serving as President-elect of the Kentucky Library Association and will be serving as President in 1980. In Kentucky, I serve on the Governor's Task Force on Education and am a member of the Governors Oral History Commission. I am a member of the American Library Association, the Southeastern Library Association, and the National Education and Kentucky Education Associations.

In this hearing today, I am speaking specifically to Title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

When I testified here before a Congressional Committee in the summer of 1977, I and others on that day strongly recommended the removal of guidance and counseling from IV-B. When ESEA was amended accordingly, I felt a great sense of accomplishment and was most grateful that members of Congress agreed. Unfortunately, I did not realize that, although you had created a new IV-D for guidance and counseling, there was no funding for this new part. When President Carter proposed in his budget to transfer $18 million from the fiscal year 1979 ESEA IV-B appropriation of $180 million and to cut fiscal year 1980 ESEA

IV–B by $12 million, our feelings of accomplishment quickly faded. This is a reduction in funds of $30 million and this from proposed figures of funding that were woefully inadequate in the face of the needs of boys and girls in our country.

We are not here today to glibly assert that we need more funding and to use the old cliche that the school library is the center of the instructional program. Instead, I would like to give some very valid reasons as to why the school library program is essential to our schools.

First, this is the only school program that can claim that it touches the instructional life of every child in the school—the slow learner, the average learner, the gifted child, handicapped children, educationally disadvantaged children, children in bilingual programs, and so on down the line.

Secondly, I do not believe that you can find any educational authority today who does not stress the importance of newer educational media and materials, both print and non-print, in the learning process. These materials are the lifeline in improving the basic skills wtihout which no learning can take place.

Thirdly, contrary to an opinion held by many, the responsibility of the school library or media center does not stop with furnishing the necessary materials for reference and research. We must furnish materials to help the student develop cultural interests and to motivate reading for pleasure. This is, possibly, our most important function and becomes of critical importance in those areas not served by public libraries. Unfortunately, there are still many of those areas. The reading habits developed by students in their formative school years will pretty much determine their intellectual activity in later years. I personally believe that we cannot afford an ignorant and uninformed citizenry, even if we let it come about by oversight.

Fourthly, in order to improve the educational function in this country, we have adopted state and regional standards to apply to our schools. The average school district in this country today cannot meet and maintain these standards in the school library by local appropriations alone. The rapidly rising cost of print and non-print materials in the inflationary spiral have greatly contributed to this problem.

We could continue with many more good and valid reasons why school library/media programs are essential but I feel sure that most members of these committees have read and thought along these lines and are aware of the essential nature of these programs. The real gist of this hearing that you must consider today is funding.

The $180 million appropriated for fiscal year 1979 ESEA IV–B would not have been a figure large enough to maintain services and programs already in existence. To cut this figure by $18 million is a devastating blow that will result in cutbacks and losses to programs that we know are working now. When we add to this a presidential recommendation of a further cut of $12 million in the next fiscal year we are backtracking on everything we have done thus far for remedial reading programs, instructional enrichment, and development of lifelong reading enjoyment.

We estimate that activities within the classroom involve instructional materials for approximately 95 percent of the class time. It is shameful to note that only 1 percent of the total education dollar goes into instructional materials.

It is my very urgent belief that we should not be here today discussing any cuts. Rather, we need to be considering continuing funding at a higher level to offset the effects of inflationary costs. Also, when we consider funding of school library/media centers, it is mandatory that funds appropriated should go directly into local school districts and out into the district for use by boys and girls.

I am concerned that under the proposal for transfer of $18 million to IV–D there will be even more guidance programs than were found under IV–B guidance was a part of that program. In fact, the new guidance program will not permit all of the funds to flow to local school districts. A significant portion of IV–D funds would remain here in Washington to establish a new office of guidance programs within the U.S. Office of Education. I am certainly not anti-guidance and counseling and, in fact, highly respect their programs. No doubt this office will greatly benefit their program, but hopefully, not at the expense of school libraries.

I am concerned also that President Carter's recommendation for fiscal year 1980 is only $149 million. This would be below the previous year's appropriation.

According to authorizing legislation, this would mean IV–B could not be implemented in fiscal year 1980 and that component parts which were consolidated in 1974 would be funded instead. School administrators are not going to look forward to administring two programs, ESEA II and NDEA III, rather than one. More paperwork is not needed now.

I feel sure that you people who are faced with the constant dilemma of funding who needs what the most, must wonder at times how the tremendous amount of funding is used and whether it is meeting needs as you desire. For your information, should you care to read them, I am attaching to this testimony some excerpts from project description sheets showing how IV–B funds were used in some of the county and independent school districts in Kentucky this year. I like these project descriptions because they are concrete examples of what my testimony to you today is all about. ESEA IV–B is federal money going directly to boys and girls all over this country for their direct use and improvement. I believe this is what federal funding should be about, and I believe that this is what you our Congressmen want it to be about.

To conclude, the monies used to fund the old ESEA II program and the present IV–B program are urgently needed in today's educational set up. More money is needed just to maintain the present level of programs. Rising inflation will make our situation even more critical. On behalf of school media people everywhere, I can promise you that there will be no program funded by any committee of Congress that will reach out and directly touch the lives of our boys and girls in a more meaningful way. There will be no program funded that will receive as much return dollar for dollar. As a matter of fact, as this money filters out into each school library/media center, there is really no way to accurately measure the tremendous impact it has on learning and culture.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to be here today and I earnestly solicit from each of you the fullest funding you can give to ESEA IV–B.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE IV–B FISCAL YEAR 1979 PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS FOR KENTUCKY SCHOOL SYSTEMS SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TEXTBOOKS

Anderson County, Ky.—Need: To maintain the current ratio of books per student; to maintain an adequate and up-to-date media center for students and teachers. Objective: To purchase library books and audiovisual materials so that students and teachers will have access to one additional item per person.

Burgin, Ky.—Need: According to the Kentucky Plan for Accrediting, this school system must have at least 1,600 books in high school and 2,500 individual book titles in the elementary school. Current books are needed to provide a proper balance in the media centers. Objective: To provide current library books which will be of interest to students and relevant to the curriculum.

Corbin, Ky.—Need: The city schools are below the state average in number of books available per child. A private academy has a high student turnover and needs a variety of learning resources. Objective: To increase the number of books per child. To purchase up-to-date German language texts and tapes and a set of 42 famous American biographies for the use of private school children.

Frankfort, Ky.—Need: By assessing the faculty and administration, it was determined that the number of library books was below recommended level, and the need for activities for building basic skills of students. Objective: SRA kits will be purchased to assist with skill building. Purchase library resources (film strips, paperbacks, etc.) to increase the learning advantage of students at Good Shepherd, Second Street School and Frankfort High School.

Graves County, Ky.—Need: First priority is for additional library resources in the school libraries or materials centers including books, audiovisual materials, and textbooks. Objective: Students will significantly increase and improve their use of library resources.

Harrison County, Ky.—Need: Library participation by the students in our school system has not increased by the percentage that the librarians, principals, teachers and supervisors feel that it should. This may be due to the influence of TV and other more attractive activities. We feel that additional library equipment and resources will attract more students into our libraries and therefore increase library participation. Objective: Students at all levels will be able to do 25 percent more library related activities due to additional materials.

Lee County, Ky.—Need: (1) additional library books in order to bring the

county average of 13 books per child closer to the national recommendation of 16–24 books per child. (2) instructional materials in the areas of language, arts, mathematics, science, social studies, humanities, consumer education, character education and industrial arts as identified by the 1974–75 Kentucky Education assessment Program Evaluation recommendations. Objective: to increase the amount of library and multi-media materials available for classroom use as demonstrated by the use of these materials in the classroom.

Menifee County, Ky.—Need: The number of library books per student is low. There are many worn and outdated books which should be replaced. Books are needed on subjects of current interest. More reference books are needed. Objective: To provide new up-to-date subject and reference books which will be attractive and interesting to the students who will use the media center more.

Newport, Ky.—Need: A survey of present library books, film strips, recordings and slide transparencies indicate that libraries in both public and nonpublic schools are below the state 1977 averages and far below the national 1977 recommendation in specific items per pupil. Objective: the specified number of library books and materials will be purchased and placed in proper libraries in order to approach the Kentucky average.

Perry County, Ky.—Needs: (1) The ratio of books to pupils falls considerably short of state and national guidelines. (2) With more emphasis being placed on reading needs of gifted, kindergarten, mentally and physically handicapped and Title I reading program, meeting demands for a larger selection of books and other media is imperative. (3) It is our aim to meet the supplementary reading needs of our regular basal series, interest and increase the gifted students' reading experience, provide books with high interest low vocabulary for remedial students and students needing special attention, and increase the choices of books and materials for kindergarten children. (4) Increased emphasis on competency based education increases the need for expansion of media services in all categories of library resources. (5) There is a priority need for a recent edition of our state's history and social studies textbooks.

Objective: 50 to 100 percent of the student population will use the new collection for reading enjoyment, completing assignments, listening to books being read, read along with a taped recording of a book or favorite passage, for making class reports, and special reading projects. Classroom teachers do and will continue to assign library reading for students in the regular classroom. Students in the Title I program will visit the library each week for an additional period to listen to and select books for reading with an emphasis on high interest-low vocabulary reading. Also, students in special education classes will find books that will interest them and that they can read. Gifted students and students with a special interest in reading will be allowed to use the library to find reading material for special and advanced projects that require additional reading. The selection of easy books will increase for kindergarten and primary children.

Robertson County, Ky.—Need: According to the annual testing program results for Deming School, 44 percent of the students enrolled in grades 7 and 8 were achieving one or more years below grade level in reading and language. Expansion of our media center will focus on development of reading and language arts through wider and more effective use of audiovisual aids. Objective: These students will respond positively toward the wider and more effective use of audiovisual materials, and less than 35 percent (instead of the present 44 percent) will be shown to be achieving one or more years below grade level.

Walton-Verona, Ky.—Need: To provide a wider variety of library materials by increasing the books available to each student. Two schools are below the state recommendations. Objective: To increase the library materials available in the two schools. To increase the circulation of library materials.

Williamstown, Ky.—Need and Objective: to purchase books for the Williamstown school libraries to get the libraries closer to the state recommended number of books per student.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. I am delighted you came. Your testimony has been most helpful.

Our next witness is Ms. Nina Ladof, director, Camden County Library, Voorhees, N.J.

STATEMENT OF NINA SYDNEY LADOF, DIRECTOR, CAMDEN COUNTY LIBRARY, VOORHEES, N.J.

Ms. LADOF. My name is Nina Sydney Ladof. I am director of the Camden County Library in Voorhees, N.J. It is just south of Camden, which must be the most blighted city on the east coast. That is just to place it for you.

This morning, rather than telling you some things you already know, I would like to share a sort of quasi-success story with you so you can get some sense of what we actually do with our LSCA money. New Jersey, as you probably know, is a very densely populated State. It is also a State of varied contrasts, from rural poor to urban poor to urban rich and to suburbia.

We have a jump on California by anticipating proposition 13 several years ago by instituting budget caps which limit local expenditure to a 5-percent increase every year. Now, 5 percent does not even begin to pick up the cost of inflation. Even before that the New Jersey libraries felt they had to somehow share resources.

We began in 1968 by setting up a statewide network. The network was supported by a combination of State and Federal moneys. The Federal money was used to strengthen existing collections from LSCA title I to set up mechanisms for moving things around through title III by producing a microfilm catalog of the holdings of some major libraries, also with title III, and then State money was allocated to strong libraries to actually perform these interlibrary loan and reference services.

I think I can explain to you best how this works and what the problems are by being very personal in telling you what happens in our library. The Camden County Library is the second level of this three-level system. We call ourselves the meat in the sandwich. We have 109 public, college, school, and special libraries in our area, who, when they cannot produce a book for a patron or need to locate a journal article, call us and ask if we can do it.

If we can, fine; we put it on a truck, which is also funded by LSCA, and send it to the requesting library and produce a happy patron. If we cannot fill the request, then we send it on to either the New Jersey State Library—which is operated partially with Federal money, with LSCA title I—or we send it to the Newark Public Library.

I don't have to tell you about the pinch Newark is in. Its splendid library would have closed down many years ago had it not been for LSCA money. It is a precious resource to the entire State. It has materials available nowhere else, particularly foreign language materials that we need, not just Spanish but every conceivable foreign language, and we borrow heavily.

If they cannot produce the book, they are then able to go to Rutgers and Princeton Libraries, which also receive LSCA grants to provide this service.

However, in 1973 the Camden County Library was able to fill 80 percent of the requests that it got for interlibrary loans. By 1978 we were able to fill only 42 percent. One very obvious reason for this is the cost of materials. We simply cannot continue to buy books at

the rate we have when in 1973 a book cost $12 average and we bought over 15,000 titles; by 1978 the price was over $20 and we were down to less than 10,000 titles.

So now we pass our requests to New Jersey State libraries, and they are in a grim position because they, too, are short of funds. The cap affects everybody. Consequently, we get only 42 percent of the requests that we pass on. So now, any citizen in New Jersey has about one chance in five of getting a book that is not in his local library. And that is not very good. We think in this day of information we should do better.

Even harder to locate and to identify are magazine articles. I understand last year over 65,000 journals were published in the United States alone. Yet, with our modest means, we are able to buy only a few hundred. So when we need a scholarly article from a journal, we have to go to the academic libraries in New Jersey and try to get a photocopy.

The LSCA funds have provided money to print a union list of serials in New Jersey which has the holdings of all of the university and college libraries in the State and, with additional funds next year if some are forthcoming, will add the unique titles that are held in other libraries.

State money has provided for a smaller version of this by each of the 25 area libraries we use every day and without which we could hardly operate.

This kind of network is going to have to be computerized in the very near future. It is simply too cumbersome. It takes too long; there are too many steps involved in identifying and locating materials.

As beginning step, the New Jersey State Library took LSCA funds and joined the Ohio College Library Center, which is a bibliographic source of over 1,600 libraries and allows one to locate a book immediately and arrange to borrow it. The Newark Public Library, if the funds are forthcoming, will join as of May. Our own library took its precious State aid money and joined the same system. So we are now able to tap other resources.

I should parenthetically say here that one of the major uses we have for interlibrary loan is for our nontraditional students. These are people who have decided to further their education by attending the college without walls, Thomas Edison College in New Jersey, or independent learning. They are independent lifelong learners, and to provide for their various needs at various levels is out of the scope of any one library. Consequently we desperately need LSCA title I and title III in order to have the materials when they need them and to get them where they are needed.

We have many projects for LSCA title I that address themselves to minority groups. And since Ms. Moss is not able to speak on title I and I am not prepared to give a long speech—and you wouldn't want to hear it—I would like to submit some evidence for the record.

[The newspaper articles referred to follow:]

[From the New Jersey Interact, May/June 1976]

LIBRARY "STORYTELLERS" BRING 30 HANDICAPPED STUDENTS JOY

(By Irene I. Schell, Director)

"Here comes the story lady! Here come the magic lady!" the little boy cried as he jumped up from the steps at the entrance to his home. This is the sort of excited welcome that greets the storytellers of the program under a LSCA Title I Demonstration Grant that is being conducted by the Gloucester City Library.

Since October 1975, in cooperation with the public school system, the library has been delivering library services, including its storytelling programs to the homes of 30 handicapped children from kindergarten to fourth grade who are unable to function well in a group. One child is completely homebound, and one child is partially deaf; all of the other children have various learning disabilities. The families of most of these children are economically disadvantaged. Some parents are functional illiterates, unable to read or write.

Five storytellers were carefully selected for this project from a field of 100 applicants. Personality, appearance, ability to work with children were paramount criteria. An intensive two-week training program was designed and conducted by Dorothy M. Stanaitis, the children's program director of the Gloucester City Library.

A storyteller visits every child for one hour each week, dividing her time between storytelling, filmstrips, arts and crafts and other activities the children request. Each session is individually designed for the abilities, needs, and desires of the particular child. As far as practical, the sessions are private, to avoid distractions, to give the storyteller complete control, and to assure the children that the sessions are uniquely theirs.

The progress of the children has been remarkable. One little boy, who would never speak to an adult, now talks eagerly to the storyteller and is beginning to speak to other adults as well. Children who never saw a book at home now have their favorites. And many parents, disinterested at first, now welcome the storyteller warmly and help their children during the week.

The books, the stories, the filmstrips, have opened up new worlds for these children and their families. After reading about foreign countries, several children wrote letters to their Chambers of Commerce and were thrilled to receive in the mail additional information about these mysterious, faraway places. Following his child's example, one father wrote to a Chamber of Commerce to obtain information he wanted about a city in the United States. Books about American Indians inspired one boy to create a model Indian village. And the story, "Boy am I hungry for a pancake", resulted in a big day in the kitchen making pancakes.

Perhaps one story about an eight-year-old boy who has spent most of his life in and out of hospitals will serve to illustrate the dramatic impact of this program on the lives of these handicapped children. Let the storyteller explain:

"We went page by page through the wonderful little book "Our Planet Earth," and Johnny was absolutely captivated. At one point, I was explaining how the earth moves around the sun and I had my fist stretched up to the light bulb in the ceiling. Johnny, completely on his own, had one of those revelations that form one of the greatest joys of intellectual life. He looked at the picture in the book, my hand, the light bulb, and said with utter certainty, "So that's where we get night and day!"

The Gloucester City Library home delivery project is now eight months old and has achieved its primary objectives—to bring pleasure to children whose lives have been hemmed in by illness and loneliness, to arouse their curiosity and broaden their interests, and to motivate them, wherever physically possible, to visit the library. But the effects of the project are much more far-reaching.

While every effort is made to keep the storytelling sessions private, it is often impossible to maintain the one-to-one basis in crowded homes and small apartments. Little brothers or little sisters can be seen watching and listening, absorbing everything. The children also share with their neighbors the materials that are left in the homes between sessions.

Parents also benefit in many ways, especially in an increased understanding of the needs of their handicapped children. One mother attended a program to help adults improve their reading skills so that she could relate better to her son's reading activities with his storyteller.

99-317 O - 78 - 9

The storytellers themselves, however, are the most enthusiastic secondary beneficiaries of this innovative library program. Each of the five storytellers vows that this is the best job she has ever had.

As one storyteller remarked, "I can't tell you how much I love this job. The children inspire me. As each day wears on, in the place of weariness, I find energy and a whole bank of new ideas. One child, victim of severe abuse in her early years, waits for me at the window and waves agitately as I pull up in front of her apartment house. Upstairs, in her living room, she proudly hands me a small glass bowl of dried flowers that she picked out herself as her gift to me."

The storytellers' unbounded joy in their work has spilled over into every aspect of the Gloucester City Library's activities, filling the staff with their own joy of shared pride in this inspiring project.

Film Lovers, Take Note: Echelon Library Has 1,000

(By Bill Jerome)

Do you ever get the urge to invite some friends over, dim the room lights, and show a movie of Richard Nixon's "Checkers" speech?

Or maybe your family would enjoy viewing "Citizen Kane," and an Abbott and Costello comedy. How about films on pollution, poverty or personalities such as Malcolm X and Norman Rockwell?

These flicks are among approximately 1,000 available from the free-loan collection of the Camden Regional Film Library, which serves a seven-county South Jersey area.

Based at the Camden County Library at the Echelon Mall, the library is open primarily to individuals and non-profit groups, according to Kathy Schalk, assistant director.

Persons over age 18 and who hold membership in a public library in South Jersey may borrow up to five films, or films totaling 90 minutes' viewing time for a 24-hour period or over a weekend.

Projectors also are available, at a $2 fee, for showing the 16-millimeter sound films, which cannot be screened for preview, Ms. Schalk said.

If you're thinking of staging your own film festival, "the real secret is to plan ahead," she said.

Just as there are waiting lists for certain books, as much as three months' advance notice may be needed for borrowing popular films.

The library requires at least two days notice for taking out any film, Ms. Schalk said.

In constant demand are Laurel and Hardy comedies, science fiction and horror movies, and films stressing positive roles for children, she said.

Some idea of the scope of the collection can be had just by skimming through catalog headings: abortion, Afro-Americans, art, Betty Boop, children's films, crime, France, human relations, nature, religion, social comment, sports, travel, war, women, zoos.

The catalog lists an audience age range for each film, but librarians recommend a pre-screening if there is doubt over the suitability of a certain film. The library can make a screening room available for that purpose.

This year, the library added about 120 new films, Ms. Schalk said. Twice a year, people from the community are invited to view films and recommend whether the library should acquire them.

The final decision on new purchases rests with library officials such as Eugene Grim, executive director, who has a master's degree in library science, and Ms. Schalk, whose college degree is in film theory and history.

Upon the films' return to the library, each reel is checked for wear and tear. Before signing out for a film, the borrower must agree to assume responsibility for any damage to or loss of films.

Those damaged beyond repair can be traded in toward the purchase of new films.

A delivery service shuttles films between the main unit and libraries in Atlantic, Burlington, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester and Salem counties.

The area is one of five regions in the State Library of New Jersey's film service program. The Camden regional facility primarily uses federal funds and receives some funding from the local libraries it serves, Ms. Schalk said.

Aside from housing a cinema collection, the library has also become a center for special showings of children's films, women's films and criminal justice films. A two-hour "mini festival" of animated films is slated for Feb. 22, in conjunction with a library exhibit of comic art and appearances by local animators.

The Way We Live

THEIR FACES PORTRAY RICH, SIMPLE LIVES

(By Peggy Morgan)

The most beautiful works of art are the faces of old people. The best books are their stories.

Members of the Archway Senior Activity Centers in Berlin, Camden and Collingswood are presenting an art exhibit called "The Life Cycle" at the Camden County Library in Voorhees through September 29.

There is the fantastical macrame of Pearl Woolfolk, 64, of Camden, who has knotted buttons, earrings, ribbons, even an ancient nameplate into her hangings.

There is a long-ago photograph of Rose Viggiano, 67, of Oaklyn on her First Holy Communion day, her small head laden like a snow princess with crown and veil. Program director Georgia Viscuso says, "The photographs show old people aren't born that way," as grandsons are convinced.

There is fabric, framed and tie-dyed mauve and dusty rose, by blind Frances McGinley, 73, of Lindenwold.

There are carousels of quilts in kaleidoscopes of colors—from the precise Pennsylvania Dutch patches of Betty Cochran, 74, of Stratford to the daffodils on blue Alberta Johnson, 69, of Lawnside.

Definitely "not busy work," as Mrs. Viscuso points out.

But the people themselves are important canvases nearing completion . . . perfection. Here are only four of them and their stories.

JULIA FOGIE

At 63, Julia Fogie is "having the greatest time of my life." She's having the youth she never had as the burdened daughter of a steelworker in Steelton, Pa., the oldest of 20 children. The vibrant mother of two and grandmother of five says:

"I don't feel I was ever young. At 11, I went out and scrubbed kitchens, I did housework during the summers. At 16, I packed up my books and left school. I woke up one morning when I was 50, told myself—it's later than you think—bought a bicycle and got my high school certificate."

She's completed many art courses at Camden County College. And Art Therapy, Man and Environment, the Biology of Aging—"What a magnificent thing the body is!" This semester it's Health and Swimming—"I get out and paddle around. . . . But I don't want to graduate too soon. I'm having too much fun."

When arthritis forced her to retire from operating heavy sewing machines, she gleefully turned to college. Now she can talk knowledgeably about negative and positive casts and press molds.

With the $150 the state Board of Education paid her for a painting selected from a juried student art show, she built her own pottery kiln in her cellar. The painting was her statement, she says, about the sad destruction of homes and neighborhoods by highways and progress.

Mrs. Fogie mastered macrame because, "I had to make hangers for my pots." An abstract painting that hangs in the library she laughs is "the wild one—far out . . .

"I do what pleases me now. I've liberated myself. I've dumped the housework. It takes me two or three hours to loosen up in the morning because of the arthritis—usually right after the Phil Donahue Show.

"But if I don't do something during the day, I don't feel I've lived that day." The electrical lady sleeps at night with some lovely thing at the foot of her bed for sweet dreams, solace and inspiration.

By day, she's the sort of grandmother who takes her visiting 14-year-old grandson to see "Star Wars" and to pick his first strawberries and blueberries.

JACK ALEMI

Jack Alemi, born Giacomo Giuseppe Alemi, Jr., in 1912 New York City, looks small and slim as Fred Astaire, whose movies he favors on late-night TV. Alemi used to be a hoofer—his term—too.

Twenties' photographs of the young Alemi, tuxedo'd, his hair in natural marcelled waves, hang from the walls of the library.

He remembers, "I was an ornery kid. I sure got hit by those nuns in kindergarten." The youngest of 14 children, he hustled newspapers to help out his widowed mother, sold bananas on the road in Beverly, Roebling and Trenton and, like his six older brothers, shined shoes.

But he also listened and learned from the people in those shoes: "Financially embarrassed entertainers would take me to a dance and show me the steps." That was outside Shorty's Pool Room at 4th and Spruce in Camden.

Another hang-out was Market Street in Philadelphia: "I hung around the old vaudevillians, bought them coffee and hoped to catch a break. I used to listen to the hoofers and try to get jobs."

He caught on so well doing the soft-shoe, the Charleston, tap dancing a buck and wing that he won a dance contest at the age of 14, with a partner he fondly recalls, Dante Sarubbi. At the age of 16, he was booked Mastbaum with the six Capitol Steppers—that was the big time—the Earle, the Shubert, the Baltimore-Washington-Philadelphia circuit.

Steppers big time—the Earl, the Shubert, the Baltimore-Washington-Philadelphia circuit.

"I worked in shows with Ann Corio. I worked the Brooklyn Paramount with Bing Crosby. That was the most exciting time. He was a nice guy. He stopped his wife, Dixie, from drinking and then she stopped him.

"I was making money during the Depression—$150 a week at the Paramount. I worked with them all: Phil Silvers, Abbott and Costello. I was in the Ed Wynn Laugh Parade.

"I think the most talented was Shemp Howard. He was one of the original Three Stooges. I had more fun with him. I helped organize the Burlesque Artists Association that Mayor LaGuardia hated."

Then he married and took a job as an expediter at RCA-Camden. He had two children—"both college graduates." The marriage didn't last but the job did, until he retired a couple of years ago.

But even with RCA, he produced the Victory Follies with an RCA unit for local war-time tours.

"Oh, I remember when Camden was good. Three years ago, I went to the Troc, where I'd performed in the Thirties. It had a runway we never had. The strippers came out and did everything. There was a broken-down comedian and one piano player. I got disgusted and walked out."

The grandfather of six says, "Sure, I can still do the Charleston. And I learned disco by watching it on TV. I go to singles dances—do the disco, the rhumba, the tango."

ADELLA HARRISON

Adella Harrison, her hair caught in a white bun, is a quiet Georgia-born woman of 69. Understandably, she prefers modern times to the good old days. A medical science miracle restored her vision, which had been obscured by cataracts for four years. And the arthritis that immobilized her has quieted.

Mrs. Harrison worked at the old Camden shipyard during the war and before that, in 1924, made men's clothes on powerful machines that she enjoyed running.

The Lindenwold resident recalls farm toil and helping her mother cook and scrub floors as the oldest of 11 children. "We used to do everything in the hard way: Carry water, cut wood, light coal-oil lamps. Today you just push a button. That's better than the olden days.

"And what a blessing it was when I could see out of both eyes." Those new eyes have watched patterns of knots form in macrame strings. One large earth-colored piece is on exhibit at the library along with a smaller navy and maroon

hanging that's dotted with beads. Her brand-new artistic creations astonish her.

"I love doing macrame. I'll keep the big one. I won't sell that. I'll hang it on the wall in my house," says the mother of five, grandmother of 10 and great-grandmother of 24, with a surprise of pride.

ANN BOTTERBRODT

Ann Botterbrodt, 70, who lives in Atco with her daughter, made the magical pompom quilt that hangs from a balcony in the Camden County library. It was made from dozens of flattened, gathered circles sewn together and enchanted.

The mother of two and grandmother of five was born in North Germany, one of 11 children. She remembers "a stove in each room, making our own homespun wool, knitting our cotton sox, not liking to take care of the geese and passing my 16th birthday on the boat to America in 1924."

Fresh to this country, Mrs. Botterbrodt did housework and learned English in night school. She met her husband, dead now 12 years, at a German folk festival and, as a young bride, ran a Long Island delicatessen with her bridegroom for a year.

When her silver filigree necklace is admired, she relates, "My husband came into the delicatessen when I was very busy and put it around my neck. I don't know what the pink stone is. When somehing is so beautiful I don't ask too many questions."

Mrs. Botterbrodt wears a pastel top she has crocheted and a black shawl she has knitted. She can make crochet thread from grain bags—learned during waste-not, want-not days. She describes herself as "so lucky, always jolly and bright . . . If my friends get lonely, I make them come over for a game of pinochle."

The energetic septuagenarian does all the cooking at her daughter's house, preserves, cans, makes German butter cakes, goes shopping, housesits and babysits, besides her needlework. She's served on jury duty: "I learned an awful lot. I just asked: What does that mean? The lawyers' expressions were very interesting. The case was a homicide."

As for her health, Mrs. Botterbrodt says, "I do what the doctor tells me. He says: You have excellent blood for your age."

Ms. LADOF. To summarize what I have been saying, let me ask that title III specifically of LSCA be funded at least closer to its intended funding than the $3,350,000 I see in the President's budget. It is needed. It is a way of saving money and improving service. It is a way of truly delivering library service where it is needed and when it is needed.

When I think of networks, I think of a pipeline. A splendid pipeline with nothing in it is not going to get you very far. A lot of materials with no way to move around is not going to be very useful, either. We need title I that will provide the materials and we need title III that will provide the mechanism to move them around. And if we would do that, I think, New Jersey's 8 million people could more or less be served in a way that is at present impossible and that they could contribute to society in a way that society deserves and all, I think, at a very modest cost. Thank you.

[Ms. Ladof's prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF NINA SYDNEY LADOF, DIRECTOR, CAMDEN COUNTY LIBRARY, VOORHEES, N.J.

My name is Nina Sydney Ladof, and I am the Director of the Camden County Library in Voorhees, New Jersey. I would like to talk about the way in which the New Jersey public libraries have used funds from the Library Services and Construction Act to work toward carefully planned objectives, and about the gap between what has been accomplished and what remains to be done to provide a reasonable level of library service to our citizens.

New Jersey is a densely populated state, but within its borders are a wide variety of communities; the counties surrounding metropolitan New York and Philadelphia are influenced by the problems afflicting the Northeast's cities, as well as experiencing growth from the overflow of those cities. In contrast are the farmlands of Southern New Jersey and the rural areas in the North as well as the tourist paradise of the shore counties.

To provide useful library services to segments of the population not generally seen as library users, programs were devised that would assist poor people, those in institutions, new arrivals with little or no English language skills, and the handicapped of all ages. Some funds were used to expand well established services, and some were used to supplement new services offered through state and local funding. A few examples will show the variety of programs, and the value of testing on a small scale for replication over a wider area:

State wide blind and physically handicapped residents of New Jersey have been served with Braille, recorded and large-print materials from the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped for many years. LSCA funds enabled the Library to install a computer program to handle its records, and immediately experienced a 22 percent increase in use. Another LSCA grant provided equipment and training for the Volunteer Taping Program that makes a tape copy of any non-text book not otherwise available to a blind patron.

GLOUCESTER CITY, N.J.

A very different way of serving handicapped and home-bound children is a project of the Gloucester City Public Library. Trained women from the community take story hours and other library activities to children at home. The program is designed to help parents help their children. As these children "graduate" to normal classroom and social activities, they often become lifelong library users.

In both urban and rural areas of the state, newcomers need information in Spanish to help them get established. In Cumberland County, the Library takes English instruction and Spanish language books to the migrant camps.

In Paterson the Answer Van (Caravana de Informacion) regularly visits Spanish speaking areas with information on survival needs such as health, family planning, job opportunities and available city services.

It is not surprising that a state with urban and rural woes should have a high rate of illiteracy. For adults, the public library is a logical place to learn to read.

Four public libraries in the Trenton/Princeton area combined to work with pairs of volunteer tutors and adult learners, using specially prepared learning materials. In the first year 67 adults broke the literacy barrier; it will change their lives. Other public libraries are adapting this program to local needs with great success.

LSCA Title I funds have been used to establish libraries in state correctional facilities and to encourage the public libraries to extend their services to county and municipal jails. Where extensive family visiting is permitted as at Rahway State Prison, special library programs for the children of inmates are offered on the premises. When inmates share films and stories with their children, a family tie that is sorely needed may be established.

I would particularly like to emphasize the sharing of programs and information that has resulted from the limited federal funds. It is clear, as money tightens up, and the cost of books, magazines, films, and information sources rises that libraries will have to share scarce resources in new ways.

A substantial part of the LSCA Title I and all of Title III grants have been used to find ways to make sharing practical. The state-wide film center program is a good example of how this works. Several thousand prints of films that will interest a wide variety of people of all ages are housed in five larger public libraries throughout the state. From each center, films can be delivered to other libraries for local use, or picked up by the user at the center. This brings films costing hundreds of dollars within the reach of every town in the state. Few libraries could afford to buy such a collection; only by sharing can the need be met. Last year over 125,000 films were seen by an audience of 5,475,000 adults and children.

More than a decade ago, librarians in New Jersey recognized the need for a network so that any resident of the state could get the books he needed regard-

less of where he lived. In 1968, using both LSCA and State funds, the Area Library system was set up to channel information and book requests from the local library to an area or regional library and then, if needed, to a research or large back-up collection. To strengthen the resources of this system, and to assure that books would be available when and where they were needed, LSCA Title I funds were allocated to two libraries that would be the third level in the system; the New Jersey State Library, and the Newark Public Library. In both of these agencies strong collections of expensive and unique materials were feeling the pinch of diminishing revenues. Since they served state wide needs, it was essential that they be kept strong. In particular, the Newark Public Library, with its art, music and foreign language collections could supply books unavailable any where else in the state. This has made it possible to fill requests for scholars, housewives, new citizens from many nations, cultural groups and ordinary citizens. For southern New Jersey the State Library fills the same function, and, with the use of federal dollars, access to Rutgers University and Princeton University collections has expanded the possibility of finding a needed book.

In order to locate what the reader wants, some mechanisms have to be set up to speed the search. A microfilm catalog of the holdings of the State and the Newark libraries was produced and distributed to each of the Area libraries so that it would be possible to locate the item wanted at either place.

I can best illustrate the problems of implementing this network by sharing the experiences of our library which is the second or middle level of this system. When a patron in one of the 57 libraries we serve finds that his local library doesn't own the book he needs, the librarian sends a request to our Loan Department. Unless the librarian calls to check, she doesn't know whether or not we actually own the book. If we have it, it is sent by delivery van (LSCA dollars support frequent delivery to our libraries) and the person who wants it is notified. If we don't own the book, we send the request to the New Jersey State Library. At this point, we can check the State Library's microfilm catalog to see if it is in their collection. However, as this catalog must be updated frequently, it is often a shot in the dark. Again, if the book is there, it goes directly to the requesting library and everyone is happy. In 1973, we were able to fill 80 percent of inter-library loan requests from our own collection. By 1978, we could fill only 45 percent—one obvious reason for this drop is the cost of books; the book that cost $12.20 in 1973 now costs an average of $20.10. Our income, constrained by the state "cap" has risen only 5 percent a year, and consequently we are buying fewer than 10,000 titles instead of the 15,000 purchased in 1973.

At the next level, that of the State Library, conditions are equally grim. Our chances of getting a particular book are now only 42 percent.

The time involved in this procedure, which involves a high degree of guess work may make a book useless when it finally reaches the patron. We need a better way to find out where the book is, request it and get it when it is needed. And that is where Title III funds are needed.

In 1978, Title III funds were used to place the State Library on line with the Ohio College Library Center, a bibliographic data bank that includes the catalogs of over 1,600 libraries in the United States and Canada. The Newark Public Library will be added this year. Participation in this network gives immediate access to book location through a computer terminal. This kind of network mechanism cuts guess work and staff time, and allows the sharing of many libraries.

Locating an article in a magazine or journal is another library problem that demands solution. More than 65,000 titles are currently being published, and the cost of subscriptions, particularly to scholarly journals, is rising even faster than the cost of books. By 1978 the average subscription was $27.58, up from $8.68 in 1968. As a library of modest means, we can subscribe to only a few hundred of the most popular titles. To get an article rapidly we need to know which of New Jersey's many public, academic and research libraries has the issue needed. To meet this need, Title III funds have been used for the development of union lists that indicate location and holdings, and that can be duplicated and distributed to many libraries. $38,765.00 has been allocated to the publication and distribution on microfiche of the New Jersey Union List of Serials which includes holdings of major universities and state colleges. When funds permit, unique titles in other libraries will be added. State funds have been used to supplement the meager Title III monies so that the area libraries can produce union lists of local library holdings. These are widely used for day-to-day needs.

In an experiment aimed at developing cooperation among different types of libraries, (public, school, college, special) two grants have been made. One links differing kinds of libraries in a large county by teletype, which decreased the waiting time for interlibrary loans by half. Another successful experiment placed a reference librarian in a college library to answer reference questions and locate books for small libraries in the surrounding area. A patron was so pleased with the speed and efficiency of this service that he donated $1,000.00 for its support.

With successful models and affordable technology, New Jersey needs to move ahead on providing fast and accurate access so that libraries can locate and share their resources as their users require. Further, ties to libraries in the adjacent metropolitan regions need to be developed. Since sharing is mutual, the benefits accrue to people across state lines. If Title III of LSCA were to be funded at, or at least closer to, its authorized level, these projects could move forward.

Library networks may be seen as somewhat like a pipeline that must move information from its source to where it is needed. The mechanism is essential, so that the flow moves quickly and directly. Initial costs of developing such mechanisms are high. But the best pipeline is worthless unless there is something to be moved through it. Costs of library materials are rapidly shrinking the rich information sources within the state. Federal funds, through Title I, for purchases of many kinds of library materials, and through Title III for the development of ways to move these items around so that everyone in New Jersey may share, must be appropriated in 1980. Library and information services are essential to all citizens, whether rich or poor, literate or unlettered, handicapped or in blooming health. Over the years, New Jersey's libraries have made a successful beginning to meet these needs. Increased federal support is essential to continue to do so in the coming years.

Mr. FORD. Thank you.

Mr. James R. Johnston, director of the Joliet Public Library.

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. JOHNSTON, DIRECTOR, JOLIET PUBLIC LIBRARY, JOLIET, ILL.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Thank you. I am James R. Johnston, chief librarian at Joliet Public Library. Joliet is located 43 miles southwest of Chicago and is a separate, freestanding city of 80,000. It is about the seventh largest city in the State of Illinois.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak here today because, as the chief librarian of the Joliet Library, I have a problem. The problem I have comes in the form of access. We have heard about secondary education and elementary education. The children we are talking about in the schools start out in the public library. They continue in the library for support of their projects. After they leave formal education and for the rest of their lives the local public library is the place they are going to go.

In the city of Joliet 18 percent of our population are over 65 in the Joliet and Will County area. And an additional 5,000 people are federally defined as handicapped.

I have a problem. The problem is that the Library Services and Construction Act, title II, shows another zero—that is, the public library construction portion of the Library Services and Construction Act.

Rather than speaking in abstracts, I will speak on something I know well, and it is the Joliet Public Library. My building was built in 1903. In 1903 you had a different set of standards for access. The standards were great marble buildings with staircases. Between any person with a physical limit and my front door there are 14 stairs. It is nice to put a ramp on but the traffic engineer in Joliet objects to having the ramp

start in an intersection. St. Mary's Carmelite Church objects to having it start in front of their building. That is what I am limited to.

The board of directors of my library is still struggling with the $170,000 it will take us to make our library truly accessible to the people who have some kind of limitation. We have had our city council offer us revenue sharing and postpone it to perform some of these structural modifications.

My problem today and the problem I wish to put you in touch with and let you think about as you discuss this proposition is—I don't ask for $170,000 but, if we are going to put down standards for access to the handicapped people of the country, if it is, in fact, their right to obtain the same library services as any other citizen, it is quite possible we have to give a start, put some seed money in the pot, take a first step and give an incentive to an agency like the Joliet City Council on some sort of beginning basis.

Give me something to take in to my city manager and say: We can get partly a matching grant; we can get some portion of that funding that is truly a priority to get it rolling. If, in fact, the Joliet Public Library is to serve all of its patrons, it is necessary to get them in the front door. It is very much necessary that throughout the State of Illinois and the greater Will County area that the headquarters library, serving 80,000 people directly, and the other 24-member libraries surrounding, get this money.

We are cutting them off. We have told our people they have the right to expect services. Literally you have told the library it is our duty to provide services. If, in fact, there is a priority in access to the blind and physically handicapped people, some sort of starter to put before the city councils, to put before the Illinois General Assembly, is, in fact, necessary. Possibly I am asking for some leadership.

In the State of Illinois a bill has been passed for construction grants. However, it, too, has been funded at zero money. The Joliet Public Library exists on 99.1 percent local funding. The other 0.9 percent comes from direct reimbursement for staff in a reference center that serves our surrounding five-county area.

Literally we are doing it ourselves. I still put down, each week, 133½ hours of public services time for the people of Joliet and anybody else willing to come in my front door. In the area of the Library Services and Construction Act I would like to make that front door a lot more accessible.

I do have a statement I would like to include for the record. Other than that I will close.

Mr. FORD. Without objection, the statement referred to by the witness will be included in full at this point in the record.

[Mr. Johnston's prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. JOHNSTON, CHIEF LIBRARIAN, JOLIET PUBLIC LIBRARY, JOLIET, ILL., AND PRESIDENT, PUBLIC LIBRARY SECTION/ILLINOIS LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

My name is James R. Johnston. I am the Chief Librarian of the Joliet, IL Public Library and President of the Public Library Section of the Illinois Library Association. I have a problem. You can help solve it!

Library Service and Construction Act, Title II was amended in Public Law 95–123 to specifically include alternations to libraries to remove architectural

barriers to the handicapped as essential for library service to all citizens, regardless of any characteristic or physical limitation. There is and has been "0" funding to do any such alterations.

"We need help in lowering the Joliet Public Library's barriers to the handicapped. At tonight's meeting, the Board of Library Directors of the Joliet Public Library again struggled with the $170,000 project necessary to bring Joliet's Main Library into compliance with the access to handicapped and life safety requirements.

We sorely need that help to enable us to complete the needed modifications to our 1903 Daniel H. Burnham building. We ask your continued support of educational activities including your local public library, your local 'open learning center' to complete the necessary structural modification."

Joliet Public Library serves 79,873 directly and 24 other surrounding library's people as Headquarters (and largest) library in a five country area. Within Joliet, 18% of our people are 65 or older. An additional 5,000 persons in the immediate Joliet/Will County area are "handicapped" according to Federal definitions. It is their right to expect and our duty to provide quality library service.

Eleven libraries in the Bur Oak Library System, of which Joliet is the headquarters library, require remodeling to meet handicapped access requirements. Our local area requires an estimated $420,000 today to correct existing architectural barriers to our handicapped users.

The state of Illinois has 317 libraries which require architectural modification to allow us to serve all our patrons without needless architectural barriers. The Illinois State Library's quick study estimates $9,185,400 is needed today for modifications in Illinois alone.

We recognize our responsibility to make our library accessible to all our patrons. We ask your help in including $25,000,000 in LSCA, Title II seed money to help libraries nationwide perform the required alterations to allow our patrons free access to our services. LSCA Assistance, limited to the architectural work needed for handicapped access, equal to the simple average Illinois' average need of $29,000, available over a five (5) year period, would provide the seed money for each local library to build on in securing the required local funds to complete the necessary structural modifications.

Our immediate problem is money. Our building was designed and built in 1903 by a totally different set of standards, even electricity for light and, later, outlets is an ADD-ON. To upgrade the facility which is only 44% of the MINIMUM size necessary to provide minimum traditional library services according to the Illinois Standard, Measures of Quality, we must utilize every local and state resource. We are working toward it.

Zero funding of LSCA, Title II indicates to other agencies, such as the Joliet City Council and Illinois General Assembly that the need is valid, but there is no drive to correct the problems. A "seed money" program could provide the Joliet City Council an example that the "postponed" revenue sharing is necessary. A "seed money" program could provide the inventive to the Illinois General Assembly to appropriate money to fund the matching state grants for construction that the IGA passed more than 2 years ago, but has NEVER funded.

I ask you to seriously reconsider the zero in LSCA, Title II. We must comply with Federal standards. If the corrections are necessary to be part of the laws of the land, at least a starter to accomplishment should also be part of the same laws.

I do not ask you to solve our whole inflation/space/service problem. I do ask you to help provide the leadership and incentives now. With the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Sciences coming up this Fall, all fifty states' delegations will be able to clearly see that the House has looked ahead. I am certain that the amended legislation and coordinated national program will help us serve our people. With your help we can take a first step now.

Thank you.

JAMES R. JOHNSTON.

JOLIET PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Joliet, Ill., May 16, 1978.

Hon. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: At the Joliet Kiwanis meeting of May 1, 1978, you indicated that you were introducing an amendment to the educational appro-

priation bill to include funds under Title VII of the Higher Education Act and under section 607 of the Education of the Handicapped. These funds are sorely needed. Public libraries require help in lowering those architectural barriers, too.

Please consider broadening the impact of your proposed appropriation amendment when you introduce it on the House Floor. Public Law 95-123 adds to the Library Services and Construction Act, Title II, the removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped and energy conservation as essential for Library service to all citizens, regardless to any characteristic or physical limitations.

We need help in lowering the Joliet Public Library's barriers to the handicapped. At tonight's meeting, the Board of Library Directors of the Joliet Public Library again struggled with the $170,000 project necessary to bring Joliet's Main Library into compliance with the access to handicapped and life safety requirements.

Eleven librarics in the Bur Oak Library System, of which Joliet is the headquarters library, require remodeling to meet handicapped access requirements. Our local area requires an estimated $240,000 today to correct existing architectural barriers to our handicapped users.

The state of Illinois has 317 libraries which require architectural modification to allow us to serve all our patrons without needless architectural barriers. The Illinois State Library's quick study estimates $9,185,400 is needed today for the modifications in Illinois alone.

We recognize our responsibility to make our library accessible to all our patrons. We ask your help in including $25,000,000 in LSCA, Title II seed money to help libraries nationwide perform the required alterations to allow our patrons free access to our services. LSCA Assistance, limited to the architectural work needed for handicapped access, equal to the simple average Illinois' average need of $20,000, available over a five (5) year period, would provide the seed money for each local library to build on in securing the required local funds to complete the necessary structural modifications.

We sorely need that help to enable us to complete the needed modifications to our 1903 Daniel H. Burnham building. We ask your continued support of educational activities including your local public library, your local "open learning center."

Thank you for your consideration. If you or your staff would like further Joliet or Illinois information, please contact me. Mrs. Henderson of the American Library Association, Washington Office, 547-4440, has offered her help in the legislative work needed and may know other interested legislators to assist in sponsoring the Educational Appropriation Amendment on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

Mr. FORD. Mr. Joseph Boisse.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH A. BOISSE, DIRECTOR, LIBRARY/LEARNING CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, PARKSIDE, WIS.

Mr. BOISSE. Thank you. My name is Joseph A. Boisse, director of the Library/Learning Center at the University of Wisconsin at Parkside, Wis. In that capacity I am responsible for the total library services provided to 5,000 students enrolled in programs on our campus.

While I am distressed at the administration's recommendation of zero funding for title II-A of the Higher Education Act because of its effect at my institution, I am even more concerned about the effect it will have on even smaller institutions of higher education throughout the country.

Statistics compiled by the American Council on Education indicate that I do not speak on behalf of an insignificant number of institutions. Of all of the institutions of higher education in the United States, 42 percent have an enrollment of fewer than 1,000 students. An additional 38 percent enroll between 1,000 and 5,000 students.

I refer, then, to a total of 80 percent of the institutions of higher education in the country. In 1976 there were some 3,090 of these insti-

tutions in the United States. We are, therefore, speaking of nearly 2,500 colleges and universities.

For what purposes do they use the title II–A basic grants? How will this recommendation of the administration impact on these institutions? These are some of the questions which I want to explore with you today.

In preparing these remarks, I spoke with librarians at several institutions in Wisconsin. These were both publicly and privately supported institutions. The smallest enrolls some 500 students; the largest, some 5,000 students.

To each of these institutions title II–A of the Higher Education Act has not been a luxury or the proverbial frosting on the cake. It is necessary to the basic functioning of each of these institutional libraries. Let me offer you some specifics. In two instances the HEA basic grant represented fully 25 percent of the institutional library materials budget. One of these institutions has 1,000 students; the other, 750.

What specifically do these libraries do with the basic grant? They purchase basic library materials to support their curricula. Without these funds, limited as they have been in recent years, these libraries will find it virtually impossible to acquire even minimal elementary resources for the undergraduate courses offered on their campuses.

At several other institutions the basic grant constitutes from 15 percent to 20 percent of the materials budget for library purchases. One librarian stated that these funds were the only resources she had at her disposal to acquire library materials necessary for new course offerings on her campus.

It is the librarian who must face the task of getting retrospective materials to support that program, and this particular institution uses HEW grant funds for that purpose.

Even more basic than buying supportive materials for course work is the need to purchase reference materials. These are the materials used every day by hundreds of students and are some of the most expensive library materials that must be acquired. There are also the materials where out-of-date editions are not particularly useful because they frequently contain erroneous or irrelevant information.

Two of the institutions with which I spoke indicated that they rely heavily if not exclusively on these Federal funds to assist them in the purchase of basic reference materials. Another library director indicated that these funds were the only resources he had to help him begin to deal with the rate of inflation.

We have heard a lot about inflation this morning but let me give you some specific data. The January 22 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education pointed out that the rate of inflation in libraries in this country has been double the general rate of inflation annually for the last several years. It has hovered in the 16- to 17-percent range annually. Is it any wonder that librarians are looking for some relief?

At my own institution we have quite a different problem. However, it is one not uncommon among institutions. We are not a government depository; hence we cannot receive Government publications free of charge. We must purchase even basic Government publications. We

cannot be designated a depository because no such designation is available to us. The basic grant funds are used for the purpose of meeting that need. They do not come near paying for all of the Government documents we must purchase but they do help us in that task.

It has been alleged by some that libraries should borrow the materials they cannot purchase. That is done a great deal but it is easier said than done. In the first place, without many of the basic reference materials purchased with these funds, libraries have no way of accessing other collections. This occurs because, without correct bibliographic data, it is impossible to borrow materials.

In addition, a growing number of major institutions are charging fees, ranging anywhere from $5 to $15, to lend a book by interlibrary loan. The same book can end up costing more to borrow than it would be to purchase it.

Libraries which are not part of statewide or regional interlibrary borrowing systems cannot borrow materials which are still in print. Libraries which do belong to such systems—for instance, the Wisconsin Interlibrary Loan System—must pay approximately $2.50 per request whether it is filled or not.

In sum, title II–A of the Higher Education Act, the basic grant program, provides funds for precisely that—basic resources. The materials purchased with this money are frequently needed if students are to receive an adequate undergraduate education.

It is ironic in these times, when the stress of higher education is on quality, that one of the most important academic resources is in danger of losing its Federal funding. Please don't deprive the students at the smaller institutions of his country of this basic, elementary help. Thank you.

Mr. FORD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ken Vance, professor and assistant dean, School of Library Science, University of Michigan.

Without objection, the prepared statement and appendixes submitted by Mr. Vance will be inserted in full in the record and you may proceed to comment on them.

Also, without objection, the prepared statements presented by each of the other panelists who have already spoken will be inserted in full contemporaneously with their remarks in the record.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH E. VANCE, PROFESSOR AND ASSISTANT DEAN, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN IN ANN ARBOR

Mr. VANCE. Thank you. My name is Kenneth E. Vance. I am professor and the assistant dean of the School of Library Science, the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. I have held that position since 1969. Prior to entering the library school I was employed as a school library consultant with the University of Michigan Bureau of School Services, which I worked with the schools in Michigan for 15 years.

My major role today is to speak for continued funding and, if possible, increased funding for title II–B of the Higher Education

Act, which has provided for both library training and demonstrations. Although funds have been made available under title II–B for library education and demonstrations since 1965, there is still a need for Federal funding of library training programs and demonstration projects.

In spite of rather rigorous recruiting there are still too few disadvantaged persons from ethnic minorities entering the library profession. Throughout the Nation today there is a growing determination to expand library services to segments of our population that have not sought out services, because citizens from these ethnic groups—blacks, Spanish-surnamed, American Indian, Asian American, et cetera—have not realized that libraries were a source of vital information for them or because they do not know how to gain access to it.

We need minority professionals to serve them. If a major goal is to attract minorities to careers in librarianship, we still have a long way to go before their representation in the profession reflects their representation in the population generally.

At the University of Michigan, for example, we have succeeded in increasing our minority enrollment in library science from 4 percent in 1968 to 8 percent—20 of 250 enrolled in a degree program—in 1978–79. This significant increase in minority enrollment could never have been accomplished without the assistance of the higher Education Act.

During the school year 1977–78 a total of 13 minority students were assisted by these title II–B fellowships—9 at the master's level and 4 were enrolled in the Ph. D. program. At least 10 of these individuals would have found it impossible to enter the program without the financial aid thus provided.

This would have reduced by over one-half the total minority enrollment in library science at the University of Michigan. Following is the employment status of the nine recipients of the master's degree level fellowships and the four studying at the doctoral level:

One: Peggy Bridges. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently enrolled in a cognate graduate program in the University of Michigan Department of Urban Planning.

Two: Patricia A. Brown. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently assistant catalog librarian, Texas A. & M. University.

Three: Leopoldo Cavazos. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently librarian of the Carnegie Branch of the Houston, Tex., public library.

Four: Monica Collier. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently librarian I, Redford Township Library, Detroit, Mich.

Five: Joyce Dedmon. Awarded the AMLS degree in April 1979. Presently library/media instructor and microforms librarian, Norfolk State College Library, Va.

Six: Olga Estrada. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently employed as an intermittent librarian in the Los Angeles City Public Library.

Seven: Cynthia Govea. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently index/abstracter librarian, Union Oil Co., Los Angeles.

Eight: Carla Lewis. Awarded the AMLS degree in August 1978. Presently librarian, Rockwell International, Troy, Mich.

Nine: Diane Rivera. Because of the birth of her child and her husband's relocation she lacked five credits for her degree at the end of the winter term 1978. It is her plan to take these 5 hours at another library school for transfer credit.

Ten: Cozetta Buckley. Was awarded the Ph. D. in December 1978. She is now head of the department of library science at Jackson State University in Mississippi.

Eleven to thirteen: Denise Glover, Blondell Strong, and Pauletta Bracy are continuing in the doctoral program.

Appendix A shows the distribution of title II–B fellowships for the current year. In addition, the university has given funds to seven minority persons as well as providing tuition grants to some of the minority students who received title II–B grants.

The availability of title II–B fellowships has helped increase the numbers of minority groups, including women, in doctoral programs. According to Dean Russell Bidlack's recent survey—see appendix B—there are presently 23 library schools in the United States offering doctoral programs.

The total number of doctoral students enrolled in 1978–79 is 395. Of these, 204, or 51.6 percent, are female, and 86, or 22 percent, are minority. Although not all of these students will become library educators, many will and, in so doing, bring about a much improved representation of the minorities among library educators than now exists, where there is a predominance of male over female and a dearth of minority representatives.

On a recent accreditation visit for the American Library Association to the University of Arizona I noted the success of its Graduate Library Institute for Spanish-speaking Americans—GLISA—which has been funded for at least 3 years—1975–76, 1977–78 and 1978–79. About 50 minority students have profited by this. It demonstrated to the university and to other library schools the need for such training programs. Placement of these students has been excellent.

The field of librarianship is a changing one. The school librarian is now a media specialist, and the public library has become the information place. Recent graduates are reporting back to library schools that they have accepted positions as research assistants, technical writers, information specialists, et cetera.

One recent graduate from our school put only a question mark in her response to the inquiry on job title. Her salary was $22,000 per year and she is actually an administrative assistant in a computer technology corporation.

At once we see a need to provide continuing education training for those educated at a time prior to the introduction of the latest technology and the so-called information explosion. Institute programs have been most helpful in the past in providing continuing professional education for librarians, particularly for school and public librarians. Because of the continuing changes in the field, the need for updating has increased, not decreased.

The placement picture within the 86 American accredited library schools has been improving. It never reached the serious problematic stage that some other educational programs experienced. Within 4

months after graduation, 65 percent of our 1975 graduates reported the acceptance of professional positions. In 1977, 73 percent indicated they had obtained positions.

We are currently involved with a followup of our 1978 graduates. At least 80 percent of those completing degrees in January and April have accepted jobs, and approximately 75 percent of those finishing in August have likewise. Graduates who do not find positions easily are largely those whose mobility is geographically restricted. Several remain in school to complete a subject master's degree.

That library schools are educating a surplus of librarians is a fallacy. A real shortage of librarians continues to exist in relation to our Nation's need for library and information science.

On March 27 and 28, I attended a State of Michigan White House Conference at Lansing and would like to call to your attention a major resolution passed by that group of 300 delegates—lay citizens and professional librarians. See appendix C. The resolution concerns the need for improved school library media services.

My past experience as a school library consultant and my continued association with public school activities in our State—I am currently working with the State School Library Association, the Association of the State School Administrators, and the State Department of Education on a statewide survey of school libraries—have assured me of the inadequacy of school library media services not only in Michigan but throughout our Nation.

Of particular concern is the inadequate service at the elementary level, where there is a lack of professional librarians to provide programs of instruction on the use of information, select appropriate learning and pleasure reading materials and to work with classroom teachers in curriculum development.

Federal funds under titles like ESEA II and ESEA IV-B have been of tremendous assistance in the improvement of library service in our schools but the situation at the elementary level is, in general, still deplorable. The greatest need is for a trained professional, properly certified, in each individual school.

If the resolution on elementary school libraries cited above were to materialize, it would take several years for our library schools to provide the needed trained personnel, including representatives from minority groups. I have no reason to believe the need for elementary school library services is restricted to the State of Michigan.

In summary, it seems appropriate to list the impact that continuation of title II-B of the Higher Education Act would have in library services. It would:

Aid in the achievement of balance in the representation of minorities and the economically deprived in the U.S. work force.

Enable each individual to conceptualize and define his/her role as a librarian or information—for example, a Chicano serving as a librarian in a Chicano community, a Chicano information specialist serving in a medical school environment or a Chicano serving as a librarian in a research institution.

Provide each participant with an access route to the mainstream of the library profession and society as a whole.

Provide for additional personnel to fill the professional gap in elementary school libraries.

Assure the culturally disadvantaged student of the opportunity to complete a graduate-library education program in face of increased tuition costs as well as the increased cost of living.

Thank you very much for allowing me to appear before this group.

[Mr. Vance's appendixes to statement follow:]

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

Biographical data for students receiving title II–B fellowships, 1978–79

Doctoral Fellowships

1. Name: Ruth Elizabeth Fenske, (white, female).

Birth: September 29, 1945.

Education: B.A., Willamette University, 1967; M.A., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1969; Twelve credits under the sponsorship of the PHS Traineeship, Washington University, 1969–70; fifteen credits in personnel and organization theory and phychology in the Department of Phychology and the School of Business, East Carolina University, 1976–77.

Experience: Project Assistant in the Cataloging Department, Middleton Health Sciences Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison, July 1967 to August 1969; PHA Trainee in Computer Librarianship, Washington University, School of Medicine Library, September 1969 to August 1970; Special Projects Librarian, Middleton Health Sciences Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison, September 1970 to June 1975; Reference/Audiovisuals Librarian, Middleton Health Sciences Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison, July 1975 to March 1976; Associate Director and Assistant Professor, Health Affairs Library, East Carolina University, April 1976 to August 1977; Acting Director and Assistant Professor, Health Affairs Library, East Carolina University, September 1977 to present.

Marital status: Single, no dependents.

Stipend proposed: $4,700.

2. Name: Jo Anne Hall, (black, female).

Birth: February 16, 1949.

Education: B.A., University of Dubuque, 1970; M.L.S., State University of New York at Albany, 1971; twenty-seven credits in education and films, University of Vermont, 1972 to 1978.

Experience: Liaison librarian for Summer Institute for Directed Research in Black Studies, Jackson State University, June-July 1973; Reference Librarian, Guy W. Bailey Library, the University of Vermont, August 1971 to present.

Marital status: Single, (no dependents).

Stipend proposed: $4,700.

3. Name: Thien Swe, (oriental, male).

Birth: January 29, 1944.

Education: B.A., Yale University, 1964; M.A., American University, 1968; A.M.L.S., University of Michigan, 1970.

Experience: News Announcer and Translator, Voice of America, United States Information Agency, September 1964 to August 1966; Circulation Assistant and Acquisitions Assistant, Library, American University, September 1966 to June 1968. Administrative Assistant to the University Librarian, American University, 1968–June 1969; Library Associate, University of Michigan Library, July 1969 to April 1970; Bibliographer, Association for Asian Studies, Ann Arbor, Michigan; May 1970 to March 1973; Social Sciences Bibliographer, Northwestern University Library, April 1973 to June 1975; Chief Bibliographer, Louisiana State University Library, June 1975 to present.

Marital status: Married with two daughters.

Stipend proposed: $4,700 plus three dependency allowances.

1. Name: Denise Marie Glover, black, female.

Birth: September 7, 1952.

Education: B.A., University of Cincinnati, 1974; A.M.L.S., The University of Michigan, 1975.

Experience: Special Collections Librarian, Zale Library, Bishop College, March 1976–August 1977.

Marital status: Single, no dependents.

Stipend proposed: $3,800.

2. Name: Blondell McDonald Strong, black, female.

Birth: January 11, 1943.

Education: B.S., Tennessee State University, 1964; M.S.L.S., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1967.

Experience: Librarian and Music Instruction, Lincoln Junior College, Fort Pierce, Florida, 1964–65; Audio-visual Librarian and Assistant Cataloger, Indian River Junior College, Fort Pierce, Florida, 1965–Jan. 1967; Librarian, Meharry Medical College, 1967–March 1973; Director of the Library, Kresge Learning Resources Center Library, Meharry Medical College, March 1973–August 1977; Assistant Professor, General Faculty, Meharry Medical College, 1975–August 1977.

Marital status: Divorced, two dependents.

Stipend proposed: $4,700 plus two dependency allowances.

Master's Degree Fellowships

1. Name: Karen Denise Armstead, black, female.

Birth: January 7, 1955.

Education: B.A., Fisk University, 1977.

Experience: Secretary, Meharry Medical College, 1975–March 1978; Clerk-Typist, F.B.I., Washington, D.C., 1978 to present.

Marital status: Single, no dependents.

Stipend proposed: $3,000.

2. Name: Robert S. Blanton, black, male.

Birth: August 10, 1948.

Education: B.A., Hope College, 1972.

Experience: Student/Work-study, Van Zoren Library, Hope College, 1968–71; Cab Driver, Dover Cab Corp., New York City, 1972–August 1973; Research Assistant, State University of New York at Albany, 1973–February 1974; Senior Library Assistant, Current Serials Department, Graduate Library, University of Michigan, 1974 to present.

Marital status: Married with one son.

Stipend proposed: $3,000 plus two dependency allowances.

3. Name: Jeffrey Nordlinger Bumbrey, black, male.

Birth: March 10, 1951.

Education: B.A., Haverford College, 1973; eighteen credits toward M.A., William and Mary, 1973–74.

Experience: Student Assistant, Haverford College Library, 1971–1973; Library Apprenticeship Program, Institute of Early Amreican History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1973–74; Papers Project Editor, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, January 1975–November 1975; Reference Librarian, The Library Company of Philadelphia, December 1976 to present.

Marital Status: Single, no dependents.

Stipend Proposed: $3,000.

4. Name: Iris Coyd, black, female.

Birth: September 23, 1956.

Education: B.A., North Carolina Central University, 1978.

Experience: Student Assistant, Detroit Public Library, 1972–73; Student Assistant, Concordia College Library, Moorhead, Minnesota, 1973–76; Secretary, Kelly Services, Detroit, Michigan, 1975–Jan. 1978.

Marital status: Single, no dependents.

Stipend proposed: $3,000.

5. Name: Eugene Estrada, chicano, male.

Birth: April 13, 1950.

Education: B.A., California State University, Northridge, 1978.

Experience: Steelworker, Carey Steel Company, Chatsworth, California, at various times from February 1969 to June 1974; Messenger/Clerk, Los Angeles City Library, 1971–June 1973; Custodian, Los Angeles Valley College and Burbank City Schools, July 1976 to July 1977; Group Supervisor, Los Angeles County Probation Department, July 1977 to present.

Marital status: Married, no dependents.
Stipend proposed: $3,000.
6. Name: Virginia Louise Fore, black, female.
Birth: May 16, 1944.
Education: B.A., City College of New York, 1973.
Experience: Receptionist, Homelife Magazine, New York City, 1973; Public Information Officer, Provident Health Center, Baltimore, Maryland, 1974 to February 1975; LAS–1, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Feb. 1975 to September 1977; LAS–2, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Sept. 1977 to present.
Marital status: Single, no dependents.
Stipend proposed: $3,000.
7. Donna Ruth Freeman, black, female.
Birth: August 7, 1950.
Education: B.S.Ed., Chicago State University, 1975.
Experience: Clerk, Chicago State University Library, 1973; Clerical/Reference, Chicago State University Library, 1973–75; Library Associate, Chicago Public Library, September 1975 to present; Acting Children's Librarian, Chicago Public Library, Auburn Branch, 1978.
Marital status: Single, no dependents.
Stipend proposed: $3,000.
8. Name: Marian Ella Montgomery Hampton, black, female.
Birth: March 11, 1953.
Education: B.A., Wayne State University, 1975.
Experience: Proof Machine Operator, National Bank of Detroit, 1974 to October 1975; Library Technician, Camp Kuwae Library, Okinawa, Japan (U.S. Air Force), 1976–December 1977.
Marital status: Married, no dependents.
Stipend proposed: $3,000.
9. Name: Cassandra Rosetta Shaw, black, female.
Birth: June 10, 1953.
Education: B.S., Northeastern Illinois University, 1977.
Experience: Library Associate, Chicago Public Library, August 1977–present.
Marital status: Single, no dependents.
Stipend proposed: $3,000.
10. Name: Mitzi Michie Tashiro, Oriental, female.
Birth: December 14, 1952.
Education: B.A., Lewis & Clark College, 1974; M.A., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1976.
Experience: Teaching Assistant, State University of New York at Stony Brook, September 1974 to May 1976; Secretary, SAFECO Title Insurance, Portland, Oregon, October 1976 to June 1977; Cashier, E. F. Hutton & Co., Inc., Portland, Oregon, June 1977 to present.
Martial status: Single, no dependents.
Stipend proposed: $3,000.
11. Name: Doris Celestine Walker Vaughan, black, female.
Birth: August 21, 1930.
Education: B.S., Saint Paul's Polytechnic Institute, Virginia, 1952.
Experience: Teacher, Loudoun County School Board, Leesburg, Virginia, 1953–1954; Teacher, Nottoway County School Board, Nottoway Courthouse, Virginia, 1954–1955; Teacher, Brunswick County School Board, Lawrenceville, Virginia, 1956 to 1970; Library Media Assistant, Central State University, Ohio, 1971 to present.
Marital status: Married with 2 children.
Stipend proposed: $3,000 plus 3 dependency allowances.

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE,
Ann Arbor, Mich., March 14, 1979.

Memo to: Colleagues in Library Education.
From: Russell E. Bidlack.
Subject: Faculty Availability in Terms of Affirmative Action.

As part of our affirmative action program, each academic unit at the University of Michigan has been requested to gather statistics on faculty availability

in relation to sex and minority status. It was suggested that each of us attempt to gather this information from institutions having educational programs designed to educate future faculty and among which we would be most likely to recruit individuals to fill future faculty vacancies. In requesting this information from fellow deans and directors, I promised to share with them the results of the survey.

There are presently 23 library schools in the United States offering doctoral programs: Case Western Reserve University, Columbia University, Drexel University, Florida State University, Indiana University, North Texas State University, Rutgers University, Simmons College, State University of New York at Buffalo, Syracuse University, Texas Woman's University, University of California-Berkeley, University of California-Los Angeles, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of North Carolina, University of Pittsburgh, University of Southern California, University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wisconson-Madison. In February 1979, I wrote to the deans and directors of these 23 schools requesting that they share with me information regarding the sex and minority/majority status of: (1) graduates of their doctoral programs from 1976 through 1978; (2) probable graduates of their doctoral programs from 1979 through 1981; and (3) their present full-time faculty.

A copy of the letter sent to each dean and director is attached along with the definition of five minority/majority groups as provided by the Department of Labor: (1) Black, (2) Hispanic, (3) Asian or Pacific Islanders, (4) American Indian or Alaskan Native, and (5) White. Foreign students and faculty have been excluded from the report since it is not anticipated that, under current federal regulations, faculty at Michigan will be recruited from that group. The report form limited faculty to those who are full-time since adjunct and part-time faculty are rarely available for recruitment for regular faculty positions in other schools. Also, the report form distinguished among faculty who are (1) tenured, (2) on the tenure track, and (3) not on the tenure track.

Responses were received from 20 of the schools appearing on the accredited list. Dean Stueart at Simmons College noted that their doctoral program is not designed to provide library educators, while Dean Hayes at the University of California-Los Angeles pointed out that their doctoral program has not been in operation long enough to have relevance to the survey. Simmons and UCLA were, therefore, omitted, along with the University of Chicago which declined to participate.

As may be seen from the attached consolidated report representing the 20 participating library schools, the profile of the present faculty is rather different from that of the students receiving or about to receive their doctorates. Whereas the present faculty in these 20 schools is predominantly male (59.7 percent), there are more women than men in the doctoral student group (204 femals, or 51.6 percent, vs. 191 males, or 48.4 percent). Interestingly enough, however, in the non-minority group of students receiving or about to receive the doctorate, there are more men than women (157 white males, 152 white females). This is in contrast to the present white faculty where there are 154 males and 99 females.

A further analysis of the two profiles may be of interest:

Total faculty, 268:

Males		160 (59.7%)
Females		108 (40.3%)

Of these 268, there are 15 minorities (5.6%):

Black males	4	8 (3 percent of total).
Black females	4	
Hispanic males	0	2 (0.7 percent of total).
Hispanic females	2	
Asian males	2	4 (1.5 percent of total).
Asian females	2	
American Indian males	0	1 (0.4 percent of total).
American Indian females	1	
White males	154	253 (94.4 percent of total).
White females	99	

Total doctoral students, 395:

Males		191 (48.4%)
Females		204 (51.6%)

Of these 395, there are 86 minorities (21.8%):		
Black males	16	54 (13.7 percent of total).
Black females	38	
Hispanic males	7	14 (3.5 percent of total).
Hispanic females	7	
Asian males	9	15 (3.8 percent of total).
Asian females	6	
American Indian males	2	3 (0.8 percent of total).
American Indian females	1	
White males	157	309 (78.2 percent of total).
White females	152	

While this report pertains to only one-third of the library schools in the United States (20 of the 60 with accredited status on January 1, 1979), the 268 faculty members in these 20 schools account for 42 percent of the total. (There were 637 full-time faculty in the 60 library schools in the U.S. on the accredited list on January 1, 1979.) The faculty profile for these 20, therefore, is probably not unlike that for the total group. Based on the salary survey that I have done for the past several years, there appears to be an annual turnover in library school faculty of about 8 percent. (There were 54 new appointments among the 637 U.S. faculty positions in 1978–79.) With new faculty coming very largely from the 20 doctoral programs surveyed here, it seems reasonable to predict that the male/female ratio will gradually shift over the next decade to provide a balance. Minority representation on library school faculties should increase rather dramatically—the percentage of minority persons receiving or about to receive the doctorate in library science is nearly four times the percentage of present minority faculty, 21.8 percent vs. 5.6 percent.

Of the 395 doctoral students (American citizens only) completing or expected to complete their doctorates between 1976 and 1981, 21.8 percent are minority. When I conducted a survey in 1973 regarding the majority/minority status of all students enrolled at that time in doctoral programs in library science, with 17 of the 18 schools then offering the doctorate reporting, 31 of 325 doctoral students, of 9.5 percent, were reported as minority. The present survey reveals a more than doubling of that percentage. Of the 325 doctoral students reported as enrolled in the 17 schools (exclusive of foreigners) in 1973, 185 (56.9 percent) were males, and 140 (43.1 percent) were females. Today's figures (191 males and 204 females) show a marked shift in sex as well as minority representation among our current and recently graduated doctoral students.

I hope that these statistics will prove to be interesting to you, perhaps even helpful.

DEFINITIONAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR AVAILABILITY PROFILES

Minorities

Following Department of Labor specifications, five categories are used: Black, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and White.

These categories have been defined by the EEOC specifications:

American Indian or Alaskan Native.—A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

Asian or Pacific Islander.—A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa. The Indian Subcontinent takes in the countries of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan.

Black, not of Hispanic Origin.—A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic.—A person fo Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South America, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race. Only those persons from Central and South American countries who are of Spanish origin, descent, or culture should be included in this category. Persons from Brazil, Guyana, Surinam, or Trinidad, for example, would be classified according to their race and would not necessarily be included in the Hispanic Category. In addition, the category does not include persons from Portugal, who should be classified according to race.

White, not of Hispanic Origin.—A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE,
Ann Arbor, Mich., Feb. 9, 1979.

I seem constantly to find myself in the situation of requesting information from my decanal friends, and I am now embarrassed to have to ask your assistance again. I cannot even promise that this will be the last time this year, because I'll soon be writing to you again regarding the statistical analysis that I have agreed to prepare for AALS based on your last COA report.

What I need from you now is information to prepare an "availability assessment of instructional staff" as part of the University of Michigan's affirmative action obligation as a federal contractor. In order to meet requirements set by the U.S. Labor Department, this analysis must be based on the availability of women and minorities in the work force. Specifically for us, this means availability of women and minorities for faculty appointments in Library Science. I made a similar study in 1976, but it must now be repeated. I shall share the results with you—I am sure that most other universities are having to prepare similar documentation for the Labor Department, so the final results should be helpful to a number of other library schools.

I am required by my central administration to gather this information from the library schools whose Ph.D.'s might be recruited for our faculty. I am writing, therefore, to the heads of all the schools in the U.S. which have doctoral programs: Columbia, Drexel, Maryland, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, Simmons, Syracuse, Florida State, North Carolina, Case Western, Chicago, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin–Madison, North Texas, Texas at Austin, Texas Woman's, Berkeley, UCLA, and Southern California.

What I need to know is the number of minorities, women, and other students who received the doctorate from your school in 1976, 1977, and 1978 who are not members of the faculties of the above schools, plus the number of minorities, women, and other students whom you predict will complete their doctorates in your school in 1979, 1980, and 1981. Please do not include foreign students since it is not anticipated that we will appoint non-American citizens to our faculty.

I also have to ask this same information regarding your full-time faculty. I have this information in the data you recently provided for my salary survey with the exception of minority identification, so I must ask that you provide this also.

I enclose a form to make it as simple as possible for you to respond. I also enclose a copy of the completed form for my own school.

I enclose a list of the definitions of the five categories of minorities as specified by the Department of Labor.

Again, I apologize for having to ask you for these data, but every dean and department chairman at Michigan is shaving to do the same thing in their fields. My only consolation is that you may find the final listing helpful in your own university.

I have an early March deadline. Could you let me have your response by the end of February? I shall provide you with a copy of the compiltaion by early March.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. BIDLACK.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT FOR 20 LIBRARY SCHOOLS OFFERING THE DOCTORATE

AVAILABILITY PROFILE A: NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING OR ABOUT TO RECEIVE TERMINAL DEGREES BY SEX, AND MINORITY TYPE, EXCLUSIVE OF FOREIGN STUDENTS

	Male total	Female total	Minority total (male and female)	Black		Hispanic		Asian, etc.		American Indian, etc.		White	
				M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1976 to 1978 (1) (including 1978) U.S. citizens only	66	51	19	1	6	2	2	2	3	2	1	59	39
1979 to 1981 (including 1981) U.S. citizens only	125	153	67	15	32	5	5	7	3	.....		98	113
Total	191	204	86	16	38	7	7	9	6	2	1	157	152

AVAILABILITY PROFILE B: NUMBER OF CURRENT, ACTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF BY SEX AND MINORITY TYPE (FULLTIME ONLY)

Tenured	114	46	4	2	1		1				111	45
Tenure track	34	41	6		2	1		2	1		34	35
Not on tenure track	12	21	5	2	1	1	1				9	19
Total	160	108	15	4	4	2	2	2	1		154	99

Note: Schools were asked not to include past graduates currently on their faculty, or those known to them to be currently on the faculty of another surveyed institution.

APPENDIX C

RESOLUTION

The Michigan White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services

Whereas, good reading habits need to be developed at an early age;

Resolved, that funds—Federal, State and local—be provided in order that each elementary, middle, and secondary school has a properly stocked library/media center, staffed by a professionally trained librarian.

Mr. FORD. Thank you very much.

Dr. Thomas Childers, associate professor, School of Library and Information Science, Drexel University.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS CHILDERS, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, DREXEL UNIVERSITY

Mr. CHILDERS. I am Thomas Childers, associate professor, School of Library and Information Science, Drexel University. I have been there about 9 years teaching and doing research of various kinds. I am going to talk also to HEA title II–B, concentrating on the demonstration and research side of the spectrum. I am also going to focus on public libraries, because that is what I know best.

In the last 15 years or so, movement in public libraries has occurred on two fronts: Reaching people who do not use libraries—disadvantaged people of various kinds—and improving the management of libraries, trying to run them better.

My feeling is, in looking at the programs that have been funded under title II–B, that HEA title II–B has either led or accompanied the library field in those departments to a very large extent. And the only way I know to demonstrate that is to illustrate with a couple of projects that I have been relatively close to

The first one is called "Measurement of Effectiveness of Public Library Service," a rather abstract title, but its purpose was, in fact, to develop measures of performance for public libraries so the libraries could demonstrate to the local officials, the funding bodies at the local level, whether or not they were doing a good job.

This has for a long time been a concern of public libraries across the Nation but there had not been the wherewithal to fund an effort at the national level.

In the first phase of this project—let me call it "the performance measures project"—we invented some indicators of public library effectiveness. In the second phase the indicators were tested in a number of libraries around the country to insure that they would be valid indicators of performance. And the people at the local levels could

apply these measures to themselves to make sure the measures had meaning at the local level as well.

Since Federal funding was ended—and that was in 1973—some of the investigators, who were the principals in this project, have gone on to work with local libraries around the country in order to have these measures applied. In at least one State, New Jersey, there has been a statewide application of the project funded by the State. And these same measures have gone on to be applied to academic libraries. So the spinoff on this has been fairly extensive.

It is clear to me that this project led the field in an effort that was critically needed. It is an excellent illustration, I think, of something that would not have happened if we had not had support at the national level. And it certainly is an illustration of something that was desperately needed.

I have in my testimony an illustration of another project, but for the sake of time I will not go into that now. Let me move on to another one that was operated between 1973 and 1975 and was called "the neighborhood information center project." Its purpose was to put together a consortium of five major city public libraries—Atlanta, Houston, Detroit, Cleveland, and the Borough of Queens.

The purpose of the grant was to allow these five libraries to establish information and referral centers, or community information centers, whatever you wish to call them, in two of their existing branches each. Information and referral—or "I and R," as we call it in the library field—is a fairly new development. It began about 10 years ago in public libraries and really gained momentum as the result of this particular program.

Before any real movement in libraries in information and referral, the Office of Library and Learning Resources had funded this demonstration, this consortium of five city libraries. The resulting speeches, workshops, news reports, and evaluations brought these demonstrations to national prominence and, I am convinced, were instrumental in having this major innovation adopted nationwide by a great number of public libraries.

The attention stimulated by the project has made additional local and State funds available to a number of public libraries across the country. For many libraries the information and referral service itself has attracted new users. Many of these new users were people who could be described as disadvantaged for one reason or another. And I think this attraction of new public by way of this new service has strengthened the local support, both political and financial, of the local libraries. These two programs, I think, are two that were unlikely to have occurred at either the State or local levels.

I think the problems of everyday operation at the State and local levels keep our eyes turned away from such innovations—innovations in management techniques and innovations in services. Support at the national level provides the wherewithal of trying new things and doing research on topics that need to be researched.

Both kinds of effort are important to movement in this field as in any other field but there are other benefits as well. With support at the national level we can undertake projects that would otherwise be impossible at the State or local level. We can coordinate what would

otherwise be fragmented efforts, local or statewide, and thus move further for less money and learn a lot more from what we do. We can spotlight matters of major importance for the whole library field and, in that way, inspire some local initiative.

The practitioners and staunch advocates of library service are a relatively small group. We are never going to command the attention that large groups such as teachers do. I am certain for this reason that it is important not only that we have the funds available to us but that the funds be dedicated to library matters; otherwise we will be lost in the shuffle. And, when lost in the shuffle, these projects that I feel are so vital to libraries would come close to disappearing.

As with any of these things, there are some improvements to be made certainly. For one, I would like to see more concrete plans for evaluation in every demonstration project. And I emphasize the word "concrete." I would like to see some additional attention to disseminating the results of the demonstration and research projects so we get more back from the buck.

Such improvements will require additional money if we are not to reduce the already minimal level of effort. It is my hope that we will see the money for such improvements as well as for more projects in the coming years.

It is my impression—and I tend to be fairly cynical about governmental programs—that the funding under this program has met with extraordinary impact for the money spent. It is vital not only that it continue but that it be brought back to the pre-inflationary levels of 1967 as quickly as it can. Thank you.

[Mr. Childers' prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. THOMAS CHILDERS, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, DREXEL UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

My remarks will focus on public libraries.

In the last 15 years or so, movement in public libraries has occurred on two major fronts: reaching people who do not use libraries, and improving the management of libraries. There has been some success on both fronts. In trying to reach people libraries have gotten some non-users to use standard library services; libraries have also attracted non-users with new library services. On the management side, libraries have improved operations by incorporating new technology (especially computers), by experimenting with new organizational structures, by increasing their accountability, by sharpening their planning procedures, and by setting up library networks. In virtually all of this movement, the field of public library practice has been led by or assisted by the activities funded under HEA Title II–B, Research and Demonstration. Let me illustrate with three of HEA II–B activities.

1. Measurement of Effectiveness of Public Library Service, 1970–1973. Total cost: $97,000. There has long been a concern in the library field that we are not very accountable for the way we spend our money—that there is no way of relating what we spend (our input) to performance (our output). The public and public officials have increasingly been demanding hard indicators of effectiveness from public institutions, libraries included. It is particularly at the local level—where most funding for public libraries comes from—that public officials have been seeking these indicators. In its first phase, this HEA Title II–B project invented some indicators of public library effectiveness. In the second phase, the indicators were tested on many public libraries around the country, to insure that they were valid indicators, that they had meaning at the local level, and that they could be applied by the local library staff. Since federal funding ended, some of the investigators have gone on to refine the indicators, and to work with libraries around the country to set up measurement programs. At least one

state, New Jersey has funded a state-wide application of the project. And these same measures have been applied to academic libraries. Clearly, this project led the library field in an area of critical need. It is, I think, an excellent illustration of an effort that would surely not have been launched through a local or state initiative, and at the same time an effort that has had major impact on the local level, as well as value at the state and national level.

2. Standards Development for Community Library Service, 1978–1979. Total cost: $120,000 (?). Public librarians have been calling for an updated version of the 1966 Minimum Standards for Public Libraries for many years. At the same time, we have recognized the fact that these old standards were based on the best guesses, rather than on empirical evidence, and that they do not take into account local differences.

This project will produce a manual that local libraries can use to develop local standards, based on local data. The manual will be a simple "recipe book" that will guide the local librarian through assessing local community need and establishing local standards of service. The manual is currently being tested in three U.S. public libraries; and the British Library has funded tests at two British sites. I am certain that the outcome of this project will have major impact on the field of public library practice for many years to come. It is very likely that it will be applied to school and academic libraries, as well, thus broadening the impact of a relatively low-cost project.

3. Neighborhood Information Center Project, 1972–1975. Total cost: $879,000. Libraries have become interested in the service called "information and referral" (I&R) only in the past ten years or so.[1] The staff administering HEA II–B, Research and Demonstration, have been at the vanguard of this movement since the beginning. Before any real library movement in I&R had been begun, the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources had funded a large demonstration of I&R in public libraries. A consortium of libraries in five cities—Atlanta, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston and Queens Borough—each developed I&R service in two of their existing branches. The resulting speeches, workshops, news reports and evaluations brought these demonstrations to national prominence. The project was largely responsible for the rapid spread of I&R throughout public libraries.[2]

The attention stimulated by the project has resulted in additional local and state funds being made available to many public libraries across the country. For many libraries the I&R service itself has attracted new users—many of whom are disadvantaged—and this in turn has strengthened local political and popular support of the library.

Programs such as I've described are unlikely to occur at the state of local levels. The problems of every day operation at those levels often keep our attention turned away from innovative services or better ways of managing our limited library resources.

Support at the national level provides the wherewithal to try out new ways of doing things and to do research on important topics. Both kinds of effort are essential to movement in the field. There are other benefits, too. With support at the national level we can undertake projects that would otherwise be impossible at the state or local level. With support at the national level we can coordinate what would otherwise be fragmented efforts, and thus move further for less money and learn more from what we do. With support at the national level, we can spotlight matters of major importance for the whole library field and thus inspire local initiative.

The funding of library research and demonstration permits many activities—such as the development of performance measures and public library standards—for which I can imagine no other reliable source of funding, yet which are vital to progress in the field. As important as the funding itself is the fact the funding is dedicated to library matters.

The practitioners and staunch advocates of library service are a relatively small group. We will never command the attention that large groups, such as

---

[1] "Information and referral" is the process of helping establish a link between a client and a resource that can help the client. An example would be when a librarian directs a client to contact the Mayor's Office for Complaints in order to have an abandoned car removed from his street.

[2] Compared to the relatively slow adoption of the innovation in the United Kingdom, where national support of the I&R innovation is very small.

teachers, do. I am certain that without dedicated funding—that is, if library support were merged with the support of other activities such as education or welfare—progress in library service would greatly diminish, and that these projects that are so vital to libraries and to American life would come close to disappearing.

As with almost anything, there are improvements to be made in this program. For instance, I would like to see more concrete plans for evaluation in every proposal for demonstration, and additional attention to disseminating final reports. Such improvements will require additional money if we are not to reduce the already minimal level of effort. It is my hope that we will see the money for such improvements as well as for more projects, that funding of the program will grow back to the 1967 level. It is my impression—and I am fairly cynical of governmental programs—that the funding under this program has met with extraordinary impact for the money spent. It is essential not only that it continue, but that it be brought back to the pre-inflationary levels of 1967 as quickly as possible.

Mr. FORD. Thank you very much.

I might observe it is not different for those of us who have been watching the process with these programs under discussion today for sometime to share your cynicism about the Federal programs even though we were quite proud of them when we wrote the law.

I would like to ask Ken Vance first, that when the Secretary of HEW testified before this committee a short time ago with respect to the administration's position on reauthorization, he placed great emphasis on the need to strengthen the major research libraries and institutions in this country. The great emphasis ended up with a proposal in the budget of level funding which is in effect a cut, while at the same time all of the other titles or parts of title II of the Higher Education Act dealing with libraries are slated by the administration's budge with zero funding.

As a representative of one of the country's major research institutions how do you view the proposed elimination funding of title B of the Higher Education Act which is intended to provide for library training, research, and demonstration?

Mr. VANCE. I think perhaps the person who would best answer that would be Mr. Shank, who spoke on research libraries.

Mr. FORD. What will the impact be at the University of Michigan with zero funding?

Mr. VANCE. It would be drastic inasmuch as more and more the University of Michigan is expected to provide materials for the entire State of Michigan. We have one of the larger research libraries in the area and we are asked constantly to share our resources with the population all across the State. And in order to keep up with the latest information, whether it be in science or medicine or whatever, we would find this to be a very drastic thing to happen.

Mr. FORD. Did you want to comment on that, Mr. Shank?

Mr. SHANK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this point if I may, I will speak about the university librarian for UCLA which, with the University of Michigan, is one of about 100 members of the Association of Research Libraries, a group banded together, institutions that have banded together to work on common problems. We circulate about 2 million volumes a year at the UCLA library. Our circulation of 25 percent is to nonuniversity of Cali-

fornia people. We serve 33,000 students but have another 11,000 registered borrowers who are citizens of the State of California and an uncounted number of people from elsewhere in the world who write to us for information. So about 500,000 of the items we circulate every year from our collections do not go to UCLA students. Our reference work of 40 percent, 2 out of every 5 people who come to the library are not UCLA people.

These are people who cannot find answers to their questions. They cannot find their books in the local public library, the county libraries and the academic institutions where they happen to be enrolled.

Libraries in this country I think have done well on a voluntary basis to share their resources with each other for their users. Title II(C) of the Higher Education Act is an attempt to assist the great research libraries in offering this service. Title II(B) would allow for demonstrations for training of people to work in these kinds of environments. And I must say I would have to support also Mr. Boisse's comments about title II(A) which provides a small amount of money to hundreds of academic research libraries around the country to allow them to do a better job to begin with before they turn to the large libraries.

What I would say is if title II(B) and II(C) and II(A) are not funded, the burden on the 100 or so members of the Association of Research Libraries, including the University of Michigan and University of Kentucky, UCLA, and others, will be exceedingly heavy, far heavier as a matter of fact than we can continue to support.

Mr. FORD. Thank you very much.

I would like to ask any and all the panelists: What are the alternative funding routes that you will be forced to follow should the proposed cuts and funding of the library programs we have been talking about here this morning be adopted by the Congress? How optimistic are you that alternatives that will work are in fact available?

Mr. CHILDERS. Let me address a relatively small program, the research and demonstration part of HEA, title II(B). One of the things, as we have watched funding for that program diminish over the past few years, is we have been on the lookout for alternative funding sources. And there are some available. Unfortunately they are not dedicated to library matters. Therefore we are in a rough scramble with much larger forces.

For instance, we could turn to the National Institute of Education—and have in fact for some funding of research projects and some demonstration projects. The National Institute of Education, however, has a particular focus that often causes us to distort what we want to do so that it will suit their needs and fit into their program.

We can also seek funds from NSF under one of their programs. Unfortunately my understanding is they are being more and more hardware oriented in those programs. And not everything we want to do is hardware or rented. The two projects I illustrated for you have virtually nothing to do with hardware.

We can also go to private foundations, and have on occasion, but again we have to make sure that we can spark their particular interest and meet their programs. And that does not necessarily match what we as the field need. And I guess that is the picture I see. So, therefore,

I am not very optimistic of making sure we can continue to orchestrate and research the things we need to demonstrate and research for the need.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Just a quick comment on specifically public library construction, the charge of the Joliet board is to render the use of the library of the greatest benefit to the greatest number. I mentioned 18 percent of our people are over 65. If they are spry they can get in. But 35 percent of the greater Joliet area are considered handicapped. Libraries should be of greatest benefit to the greatest number.

We are making those budget priority decisions. How optimistic am I at alternate sources of funding? For 2 years running the city council has postponed the money we need to fulfill the access requirement for the blind and physically handicapped. It is still on the agenda, and is there, but it just is not happening.

An incentive is needed to start the actual happening. If it really is a priority, we have got to start funding it. We are going to take what steps we can within our limits, but there sure is not much we can do within our limits of funding.

We have all heard of property taxes and the revolution away from them. That is where 99 percent of the revenue comes from.

Thank you.

Mr. FORD. I might observe that since the passage of section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act we have superimposed on your local definition of "serving the greatest number possible" an absolute.

That is, that you will remove barriers to the handicapped. The test you must meet is both the local test contained in the charge for the operation of your library and the Federal requirement. We are requiring you to do something that apparently we are unwilling as a Federal Government to finance.

Anyone else wish to comment?

Mr. BOISSE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to smaller academic institutions and what they will do to find this money, I am afraid that they have perhaps exhausted most of their sources of funding at the local level. You have the private institutions and the public institutions. I think you all are very much aware of the pressures that private academic institutions, especially the smaller ones, are feeling at this time, and of the growing number of these institutions that are closing up shop.

I think it unfortunate because I do think they serve a very definite purpose. At the State level, while we have not undergone I know in our State proposition 13, there are rumblings of that sort of thing. We have had some of the infamous gentlemen from California come to visit us in Wisconsin to try to further their goals.

I think frankly what will happen with much of the smaller academic institutions insofar as library resources are concerned is that slowly what we will see is a deterioration of service that will result in an erosion of the higher education in this country at that basic level.

At the level where students are acquiring their bachelor's degree, without which they are not going to go on to get their master's or Ph. D., without which they are not going to be equipped to use the resources that are in fact being made available through title II(C) of this act.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. FORD. I know that Congressman Hawkins may feel constrained to react to both of us, but we back home refer to the gentleman from California as a remarkably successful snake oil salesman. [Laughter.]

And would like to believe that is a Western phenomenon; that we in the slightly older Midwestern States dispatched our snake oil salesmen west of the Mississippi. And he came to our State and provided the impetus for a similar proposition on the ballot. In 1 weekend he stirred up enough commitment to get the requisite number of signatures. But when the people in Michigan had an opportunity to reflect on what was happening in California as the result of proposition 13, they rejected that proposition in November by an overwhelming number of votes.

Mr. BOISSE. I would like to agree with you that it is a Western phenomenon but I am not going to bet on it.

Ms. BEDFORD. Speaking for the school's section, I mentioned before, of course, we have local funds. I think in all states now there is a minimum standard set up. In the State of Kentucky it happens to be about $4 for this school year. It will be $4.50 for the the next school year. Thanks to Governor Carroll's programs here in the last few years we do have a fully funded textbook program now and an instructional fee program.

In my particular school district this year out of that institutional fee program are profiting for school media supplies in one of our buildings to the tune of $1,300.

Other than those things we have nothing with which we can refer.

Ms. LADOF. I would just like to speak to public libraries which have very limited means of finding money. It is based, as you know, largely on the local property tax. In New Jersey, as I indicated earlier, we got the jump on California by passing a cap law in order to get the State income tax passed to reduce local property taxes.

So we are really caught between a rock and a hard place.

I have just come from our Governor's conference. And from the news there we have really with great effort managed to increase our state aid to libraries by one-half million, which does not go very far.

We are now up to 80 percent of full funding. We have a cap on State expenditures and one on local expenditures and virtually no sources of private income for public libraries doing a public job. The Federal money has always in New Jersey been seen as a seed to expend—to stimulate local expenditure. And it has done remarkably well. Our state aid program has been one of the earliest and one of the largest. But we are now reaching a point now where if the Federal component drops there is no substitute. There is no way we can see that the sharing of resources and the necessary hardware and software that goes with that can be funded from other State or local sources unless we sacrifice the basic services to the residents of books, and children's programs, adult programs, and all of those things that mean "library" to the residents of New Jersey and to the other 50 States.

So we really come to you as a court of last resort. There is no place else to go.

Mr. FORD. I am informed that in spite of all the rhetoric accompanying the adoption of Federal revenue sharing, which sends "no-strings-attached" money to the States and to the local units of governments,

and about how this was going to help a number of functions—libraries were always mentioned prominently as one of the functions which would benefit directly from this money once it was placed within the discretion of the States and localities to spend it—that over the history of that program starting in the early seventies, less than 1 percent of the money nationally has found its way into library activities.

I was very surprised to discover this fall in Chicago that the Chicago Public Library is an exception. This is credited to the former mayor of Chicago who had a very special relationship with the libraries and concern for their continued health. He shared a substantial part of the city of Chicago's funds with the library.

It was made rather clear to me that it was an individual commitment by a very strong, and sometimes controversial but beloved to librarians, mayor of that city. At the time, they had some concern about what would happen in the future. Do any of you have evidence that any of these billions of dollars that we have spent since the early seventies have found their way into the libraries with which you are most familiar?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Within the northern area of the State, especially at the township level it has been very successful for libraries to get together and go before the township board of auditors and to obtain some assistance on a one-time basis through the township board of auditors. The City Council of Joliet has included the use of revenue sharing for some of these library improvements uses. The problem that happened this year and will happen again is their capital improvement program includes all the city departments. When there is an unforseen contractual raise and it means that other city employees need money, they start going down their priority list and we become postponed again. We are again hopefully funded for 1981 but again it has not happened yet.

Ms. LADOF. The only experience I have is being turned down by 37 municipalities when I went before each one and asked for Federal revenue share for specific purposes. In several cases it was construction seed money. And each time I found it was impossible to compete with garbage, solid waste, police, and fire. That is where the bulk of the money at least in our county is going and it is indeed a substitute for local money.

It is not additional money. So our rate of success has been virtually zero.

Mr. VANCE. Probably, I am prejudiced inasmuch as I am a library educator but I have witnessed the purchase of books and construction of buildings. And we have been talking of school libraries and the amount of material going to elementary and secondary schools. But one of the real problems is the lack of trained personnel. And again as we talked about the elementary school libraries and making the things visible, it is one thing to build a building and stock it with the best of materials, but unless there is a professional person there to direct activities, nothing really happens.

That is why I hope that we might have some way so that a professional person would be on the spot to work with the material that comes in through whatever money is available to them.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. No questions.

Mr. FORD. All right. Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have just one question, no, one comment I suppose. I am very much concerned about the need to make certain that our library facilities are adequately funded. I think that there is a danger in the President's new recommendation that we will lose the ability to do some of the things I consider important. I am concerned though about one of the things that was just said by Ms. Ladof. One of the things that we try to do is to see to it that we are able to assist communities in achieving what it is they want to achieve if those things are a high priority, as I think libraries are. Yet, it seems to me as I interpret what you just finished saying, you are saying the Federal Government ought to provide individual funds for library services in New Jersey because when you went to the community governments in New Jersey they said it was not a very high priority with them.

And I don't think that is quite the way you meant it but it is as though you are saying:

Give us some help. We have to have libraries in New Jersey because the people in New Jersey want them.

Would you clarify what you are saying?

Ms. LADOF. I am sorry if it came out that way because I don't think that clearly reflects New Jersey's priorities. I was speaking specifically of Federal revenue sharing which is seen by our local governments as a means of bailing out their soaring expenditures in certain categories. And they consider, I think quite rightly, that garbage does have a higher priority than libraries.

At least when they can't collect my garbage, that is how I feel. But as I indicated earlier, New Jersey has made an extraordinary effort for local support. It is a State with extremely high home rule feelings, very strong emotional feelings about home rule, but there is State aid to libraries. So what I think I was saying is that New Jersey had really done a large and credible job but that certain aspects of library service, which really override even State lines, deserve and need funding as a partner, not as the sole source and not even to bail us out temporarily but as a partner with a legitimate interest in providing library service for people who will be voters, who will be contributors to society on a nationwide basis.

They will not live in New Jersey all their lives. They may go elsewhere.

Mr. EDWARDS. What sort of record do you have in terms of going to the citizens with bond issues to raise money for libraries? Do you get a good response when you do that?

Ms. LADOF. Bond issues in New Jersey are used for capital improvements only, for construction. We have no basis in law to use them for materials or salaries. Yes, we have a good record. And LSCA title II construction has provided seed money for a number of buildings. I happened to come in at the tail end. Our building was constructed after the demise of title II so it was constructed, $3\frac{1}{2}$ million, entirely with local bond money. And I think that throughout the State there has been a very good building program.

We too have a State construction law that has never been funded.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wonder if anybody else wants to comment? What I am getting at is if this reduction in funding does in fact become a reality, what possibilities are there of making up lost funds through your communities, through your States, through bond issues? I know every State has different laws in regard to the bond issue but to what extent can going from Federal funding to other sources make up some of what we have here, endowments or whatever?

Ms. LADOF. I would reiterate New Jersey has a cap law. And that cap really is severely restrictive of any local initiative. The only possibility for increases is increases in rateables.

Mr. EDWARDS. Anybody else have a comment?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The State of Illinois has a construction-grant program authorized and not appropriated. We are working on it. Quite literally within the city of Joliet that is how I would have to rebuild the building. And over the past 17 years our average rate of growth has been 2.39 percent because the downtown—it is a 120-year-old city and the downtown area is devaluing faster than the outside areas are growing.

That literally is of prime concern because the town itself must survive.

A referendum is the way we would have to go for a tax-rate increase. And politically I don't think it would happen: A tax referendum for capital to build the building because—and right now I don't think that will happen because the city is committed to downtown development on the capital bonds it already has available to it.

Mr. BOISSE. Most of the academic institutions for which I spoke are not the kind of academic institutions that have sizable endowments. They are small colleges on a hand-to-mouth existence and they just don't have that source of funding.

Mr. EDWARDS. Let me comment finally, before I pass on, not with a question but an observation. I am very pleased that you all came to testify before us because there is a financial crunch in the country. I think everybody recognizes that. And you probably, when you are not talking about library services, are talking about how we need to cut Federal spending and get inflation under control. And I think we all understand that. When you are in government what you have to do is choose priorities. And I am not bothered sometimes when we put some of the things as priorities that we do, that because we are more concerned about foreign aid programs and other things, we don't have enough money for libraries.

I think it a matter of getting things in their right perspective. And I think you all are right in your suggestion that keeping these library services going is an essential part of creating the society we want. So I appreciate your coverage and talking to us.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Hawkins?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to certainly commend the witnesses for very fine presentations. I think at the beginning, Ms. Bedford had said that she was very pleased that—she was very pleased at the reaction she had obtained and felt that she perhaps did not need to say very much to be influential. I think all the witnesses have

been very influential. However, I think that it should be well known, Ms. Bedford, that unfortunately, possibly the views expressed by some of us are not necessarily the views of the Congress. I think you have to make a sharp distinction in those of us who may make statements that may be encouraging for you. Unfortunately the solution or the relief that you seek does not lie in what you do in connection with this hearing.

It seems to me that it rather lies in somehow attacking the mood of the country at this time.

That is, what is perceived to be the mood in terms of what is needed to solve some of our very different economic problems. So the problem becomes more political and economic than it does in terms of what this hearing is all about. As I understand it, most of the money that supports library services, about which you have testified very ably today, comes from local governments and only a very small amount, roughly about 5 percent, comes from the Federal Government itself, that it is highly supplemental in nature.

But, I am quite sure even if a vote were to be taken even on this committee, the cutbacks might be restored, but I think it would be a very small vote, a small difference in that particular vote. And I would say that if the issues that you support today were to be submitted to the House, you would be defeated, I would roughly guess, at least 2 to 1.

I think that is the job we face. I don't think enough is being done at the local level to really make a distinction between those who believe that the way to balance the budget is not merely to go out in some hysterical manner and just vote for anything that reduces the size of the budget. Those same individuals in other instances will vote for extravagant expenditures for things they believe in, but when it comes to services of this nature, are going to cut back and make it very difficult for you to obtain any possible relief.

The question of proposition 13 has been bandied about a lot. However, I think it is well to understand that the people are seeking relief, are seeking tax relief; and that we somehow have got to convince them that the way to get that tax relief, which they badly need, as they did in California, is through a progressive tax system, and that we cannot possibly impose any additional taxes on local property owners.

That is why I think you are right in trying to get it through a progressive tax system and certainly at a level of government in which the tax base is much broader. That is our hope.

We can balance the budget by a progressive tax system, rather than cutting out the services that we badly need. And, the people are certainly entitled to those services. So, I think you have got to really go to your, go back to your communities, and make a distinction between those who sincerely believe that we can balance the budget, but not in the way we are going now. We have tried this way of balancing the budget, by just simply cutting back on essential services and necessary programs—and this certainly is one of them, and it has not worked.

There is nothing that has more to do with productivity in this Nation, that would help us to balance the budget, than having an informed and intelligent work force, of which the services you rendered are definitely part of that. We are certainly not going to achieve

political stability in this country if we are going to make everybody illiterate by depriving them of even good reading or the services you provide.

So, we are headed in the wrong direction.

But, I think you have got to distinguish between those who are trying to do the job, in spite of political risks involved, and those who are going to vote, every time there is some issue before the Congress, to cut the budget.

Right now all the Members ask "Is this a vote to cut the budget?" And, if the answer is yes, there is a vote to cut the budget and, so they vote. That is about as intelligent as it is. And I think it most unfortunate. I think some of you who vote the issue as well as you do have got to carry on a much better campaign to educate the public that we are not going to balance the budget or solve the problem of inflation the way we are doing it now. There are some better ways of doing it if we want to do it.

And we have got to do it the better way, but the way we are attempting to do it now is simply a political solution that is dangerous to the security, and certainly even to the national defense of this country.

Now, my thoughts, perhaps, may not make much sense to you, but I am simply confessing that as far as some of us are concerned, we know what is going to happen and we know the cuts you deplore are not going to be restored at the present rate as long as we have the mood as it is. And, even the President that some of us supported and put into office because we thought he would do something about it, has caused us to become a little discouraged because we think he is not doing it. So we have to attack this mood.

You have that responsibility as well as the rest of us. Again, I want to say to the witnesses you have given a very excellent presentation. You will have an impact on those who have not heard you today. But, you have got to go out and get some of those other Members in the House who have not heard you today and tell them the same story you have told us.

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you.

I would like to thank the group for coming here today—this panel from coast to coast and several of you in between—and to commend and compliment you on the testimony we have heard. My colleagues have already pointed this out, that you have underscored the burden that falls on each of us who are Members of this Congress to be very selective in picking our spending priorities. I, too, share the concern that I sense from Members of the Congress and from the panel today over some of the administration's spending priorities when we see here a cut in what I think is a very vital service of a few million dollars, not that a few million dollars are not very significant, but in recent days we have seen commitments made of several billion dollars—and we need to remember each billion dollar is $1,000 million—to some other nations for weapons of destruction.

So I think we have to carefully review our priorities.

If I could be permitted to make a personal testimony. As one, with children in five different schools, I just want to add from our experience as a family the importance of basic reading skills and the avenues

to practice and utilize them. I think they are fundamental to every level and every form of education.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FORD. Thank you very much. I want to on behalf of Chairman Perkins and myself as well as the other members of the committee to thank the panel for the preparation of your statements and your appearance here today. I believe that the staff will extrapolate from your statements and develop a condensation for us, which Chairman Perkins and I will present to the Appropriations Committee and the appropriate members of that committee.

An understandable condensation of what you have to say is a part of our efforts to persuade them that Congress really meant it when we enacted these parts of the law.

I also would like to ask unanimous consent that the memorandum prepared by the staff for the members of both subcommittees, summarizing the library portions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act that have been discussed here today, be inserted in the record at the beginning of the hearings after the opening statments of both chairmen.

[The memorandum referred to above follows:]

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1979.

MEMORANDUM

To: Democratic Members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education and the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education.

From: Jack Jennings, counsel, and Nancy Kober, staff assistant, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education; Pat Rissler, deputy staff director, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education.

Re Background information for oversight hearing on Federal library programs.

On April 3rd, the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education and the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education will hold a joint oversight hearing on several programs providing Federal aid to school, college, and public libraries.

TITLE IV–B, ESEA

Title IV–B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act makes funds available to school districts for the purchase of instructional materials and school library resources. Prior to passage of the Education Amendments of 1978, IV–B funds could also be used for guidance, counseling and testing activities, with local school districts deciding how much money to devote to each area. This was a result of a consolidation of several programs under Title IV of ESEA in the Education Amendments of 1974.

However, testimony from guidance counselors, librarians, and others during oversight hearings in 1977 indicated that this consolidation was creating keen competition for funds and administrative complexities, since the two programs were of very different natures. To resolve this situation, the Education Amendments of 1978, P.L. 95–561, contained an amendments which took guidance, counseling, and testing out of Title IV–B and placed these activities in a new, separate category, Title IV–D. Consequently, Title IV–B today deals only with library books and audiovisual equipment.

P.L. 95–561 also included amendments to Title IV–B which clarify that materials and equipment purchased must be used for instructional purposes only and which strengthen the provisions for private schoolchildren.

Title IV–B funds are distributed to State departments of education on a population formula; in turn, the States are required to pass on funds to local educa-

tional agencies, giving special consideration to LEAs with more high-cost children or with greater tax effort.

For fiscal year 1979, $180 million was appropriated for Title IV–B. In order to conform with the new organization of the title, the Administration is requesting that $18 million of this money be diverted to the new Title IV–D for guidance and counseling, leaving $162 million for instructional and library resources. For fiscal year 1980, the President is recommending $149.6 million for Title IV–B, a cutback of $12.4 million.

TITLE II, HEA

Title II of the Higher Education Act authorizes a variety of programs for the support of college and university libraries and the improvement of library training programs at this level.

Title II–A, funded at $10 million in fiscal year 1979, assists postsecondary institutions in acquiring all types of library resources. Title II–B, funded at $3 million, has two components: library career training grants to higher education institutions, aimed at training more professionals and paraprofessionals and recruiting women and minorities in the library fields; and library research and demonstration grants for developing nationally applicable models of alternative ways to meet information needs. Title II–C, funded at $6 million, provides aid to major research libraries to maintain, strengthen, and expand the availability of their collections.

All of these programs expire at the end of fiscal year 1979 and will be considered as part of legislation to reauthorize the Higher Education Act.

For fiscal year 1980, the Administration is proposing eliminating funding for all of these programs except Title II–C, for which $6 million is recommended.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The Library Services and Construction Act assists States in providing library services to unserved or underserved areas; in improving the quality of information services, especially to disadvantaged populations; in strengthening national or regional resource centers; and in establishing and maintaining interlibrary cooperative networks. These programs were recently extended through 1982 in P.L. 95–123.

The appropriations for all the LSCA programs for fiscal year 1979 totaled $67.5 million. For fiscal year 1980, the Administration is proposing a cutback of $7.3 million, to $60.2 million.

Mr. FORD. We have had presented to us a publication entitled "A Perspective on Libraries." Without objection, I would ask that this be inserted in the record at this point. It is a very concise and fine overview of the American library structure as it exists today in terms of readily understandable numbers, as well as descriptions of our intent when we talk about libraries in this country in 1979.

[The publication to be supplied for the record follows:]

A Vast National Resource

Free and accessible to all Americans, our libraries preserve the past, put the present in perspective, and prepare us for the future.

One scholar has called the library "a perfect wilderness for the mind"; it is also a notably peaceable kingdom where men and women of all ages can find intellectual challenge as well as comfort, pleasure, relaxation, and stimulation.

Researchers, writers, historians, physicians, politicians, lawyers, designers—people of all professions and persuasions—depend on the library to keep the world's record and make it retrievable. The charge is not inconsiderable in view of that record's size and almost infinite variety.

Almost no American student grows up without using a school, public or academic library. In general, the higher the academic level achieved, the more significant the role the library plays. And every American, regardless of education, can continue to grow through library resources and programs.

Contemporary American libraries—shaped as much by those who use them as by those who serve in them—are a mirror of our society's achievements as well as its potential.

Facts and Figures

How Many Libraries?

There are about 100,000 libraries in the United States, shared by more than half the country's adult population and most of its young. Generally, professionals categorize libraries this way:

Public Libraries main libraries and branches	14,600
School Libraries media centers in elementary, middle and high schools	75,000
Academic Libraries and special libraries affiliated with colleges and universities	4,000
Special Libraries including medical, law, religious libraries and libraries maintained by companies and associations devoted to specialized subjects	10,000

How Many Books?

About two billion. However, libraries hold more than books. Holdings include all types of printed materials, as well as records, tapes, pictures and even objects for study.

Circulation?

Yearly circulation in public libraries alone is over one billion books, enough to supply every man, woman and child in the country with at least five books a year.

Circulation in public libraries rose 11 percent between 1974 and 1977, according to an annual University of Illinois study.

How Much do Libraries Spend?

American public, college, and academic libraries spend over $8 billion annually for books and other materials as well as for salaries and other operating expenses. About half goes for books and periodicals, a figure that has doubled in the last decade, not because libraries are buying more but because of rising costs.

Public Libraries

Total annual expenditures
$1,000,000,000

70% of all public libraries spend less than $50,000 a year

50% spend less than $10,000 a year

How Much do Libraries Cost Us?

The cost to the average citizen for public library services per year is about $3.50. State and local expenditures for libraries vary from under $5 per person to more than $15.

Still, all library services funded through federal, state and local governments cost less than one half of one percent of what consumers spend in a year.

Local taxes are the mainstay of public library support:

Local Government	82%
State Government	10%
Federal Government	8%

* All figures are rounded and are based on most recent available estimates. Sources used include: The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 23rd Edition, 1978; Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1978; The American Library Directory, 1976-77; Public Library Statistics, Library 1, 1974.

What About Services?

They have grown!

Because it is the aim of the professional library community to make all materials available to all Americans, access to our vast resources is a major consideration.

Today, many libraries are part of networks which make their books and materials available to users in other communities through member libraries.

Computer Data Banks ...

not only link one library to a system, but also offer users a rapid and comprehensive method of searching periodical literature for specific articles.

The Chemical Abstracts, Engineering Index, and *MEDLINE* are just three of dozens of automated indexes that hold abstracts of articles accessible by subject, author, and title.

Micrographics ...

make it possible to store large amounts of material in a very small space and still retrieve articles for current viewing quickly.

Telecommunication ...

is a new library capability that will allow transmission of bibliographic data, texts, and educational programs aimed at both special groups and the general public.

What's on Loan?

Books, of course, but increasingly over the years a wider range of periodicals, as well as objects for decorative and educational use. Among other things, libraries lend toys, pictures, tools, films, tapes, records and games.

What's New in Library Programming?

Libraries program to fit the needs of their own user communities, and over the years they have expanded to include ambitious undertakings both in and out of the library.

Children and young adult services include storytelling, book publishing for youngsters, parent-toddler sessions to help encourage reading, daycare services, teen parties, films for young adults, and career counseling.

More libraries are undertaking programs to help improve the reading skills of the functionally illiterate adult. Libraries are reaching out to senior citizens with everything from books by mail to in-library concerts.

Thousands of Americans attend courses for credit in libraries every year.

On the phone, librarians answer a staggering variety of questions and refer people they cannot help with specific information to other community organizations. Some libraries even offer basic service counseling.

From Ben Franklin's small Philadelphia circulating library to the vast mine of information developed over the ensuing two and a half centuries libraries have grown not just in buildings and books, but in imagination, commitment and service capability to millions.

Current Habits and Attitudes

Who uses the public library?
How much?
What newer library services are most appealing?
How much do people know about library funding?
Do parents think school libraries are important?

In thinking about our public libraries, their present and future, the answers to these questions may be helpful. To get current opinions about these issues—and others—the American Library Association, assisted by a $50,000 grant from Baker & Taylor, commissioned a study of a representative sample of Americans during the summer of 1979.

The study was conducted for the ALA by the Gallup Organization, and included telephone interviews of over 1,000 men and women, aged 18 and over. The respondents were asked twenty-two questions related to library use, reading, and television as it may affect reading

About How Many People Visit the Public Library During a Year?

About 51 percent of Americans aged 18 and over have visited the public library in the last year. The "heavy" library user (that is someone who has used the library over 25 times in the last year) is typically:

- 18-34 years of age
- college educated
- living in a household with children under 18
- a resident of the Eastern part of the United States

Some characteristics of the 47 percent of American adults who have *not* been in a library in the last year:

- 50 years of age and older
- high school education or less
- living in a household without children
- a resident of the South or Midwest

Library Visitors

Times Visited Public Library in Past Year	Total	Heavy	Medium	Light	Non-Visr.	Any Lib. Visr.	Sex		Age			No. of Children	
							Male	Female	18-34 Years	35-49 Years	50 yr. & Over	Under 18 Yrs.	No Children
Not At All	47%				100%		48%	46%	33%	47%	60%	39%	53%
1 to 5 Times	25			100%		50%	25	26	30	28	18	30	23
6 to 10 Times	8		47%			15	7	8	9	7	7	8	7
11 to 25 Times	9		53			18	8	10	10	9	8	11	8
Over 25 Times	9	100%				17	8	9	13	8	4	10	7
Don't Know	2						3	2	2	1	3	2	2

What Services Does the Average American Use When Visiting the Public Library?

Among those who visited a public library in the past year, three-quarters took out a book, and over half used reference materials like the encyclopedia. Newspapers or magazines were used by almost half (48%) of the respondents. Twenty percent took out records, tapes or films, 18 percent said they heard a speaker, and 6 percent said they took a class. The heavier the library use, the more likely the user was to take advantage of each of these services.

Twenty-five percent of the respondents said they telephoned or visited the library to get the answer to a question. Phoning was slightly more common than a personal visit, but a quarter of those who contacted the library to get an answer to a question said they both phoned and visited the library.

In the 1975 Gallup study, books and reference materials were also mentioned as the services most frequently used by the respondents. Although the percentages of use vary slightly the following awareness/use table may be of interest:

Service Provided*	Total Aware of Service	Total Used Service	Proportion Using Based on Those Who Have Service
Book loans	99%	98%	90%
Reading areas	88	47	54
Magazines/Newspapers	80	39	49
Reference/Research Service	67	41	61
Copying equipment	57	29	50
Storytime for children	56	11	19
Record loans	51	18	36
Movies	48	12	25
Music listening areas	33	10	30
Inter-library loans	32	12	39
Meeting rooms	32	6	20
Books for handicapped	32	2	6
Microfilm	31	11	34
Foreign language recording	29	4	13
Art loans	24	5	19
Book clubs	25	3	11
Craft/Basic skill classes	14	3	21
Adult independent learning	9	2	22
Reading classes	7	1	7

*1975 Gallup Study-The Role of Libraries in America

When You Visit the Library, About How Often Would You Say You Get What You Want?

Are You Satisfied or Dissatisfied With Some Library Services?

Satisfaction among library users runs very high. Among all those visiting the public library in the last year, two out of three say they "almost always" get what they want. Further, library visitors indicate high levels of satisfaction with other aspects of operations and services. The heavier the library use, and the more the average American reads, the more dissatisfied he is likely to be with library hours,and numbers of copies of both popular and technical books available.

Satisfaction With Library Services:	Heavy Users	Any Library User
Hours Library is open		
Satisfied	81%	84%
Dissatisfied	20%	14%
Number of Popular Books Available		
Satisfied	77%	70%
Dissatisfied	19%	17%
Availability of Technical Books Wanted		
Satisfied	61%	60%
Dissatisfied	22%	16%

10

How Interested is the Average American in Some of the Newer Library Services?

A computer to use for searching for information or books caught the imagination of more respondents than any other of the services listed, especially among heavy library users. "People to provide information on the phone" was second highest in registering as a service in which respondents would be "extremely interested".

It is notable, however, that nearly 40 percent of the high school graduates (no college education) said they would be either "extremely interested" or "very interested" in having help with development of their reading skills.

Interest in Newer Library Services	Non Visitors	Any Library Visitor	Heavy Users
Computer for use in finding books/information			
Extremely and Very Interested	39%	55%	70%
Not at all interested	39%	23%	16%
Books with large print			
Extremely and Very Interested	33%	34%	39%
Not at all interested	51%	42%	32%
Class of special interest			
Extremely and Very Interested	34%	50%	61%
Not at all interested	38%	34%	18%
Films/records/tapes on loan			
Extremely and Very Interested	36%	50%	58%
Not at all interested	39%	27%	19%
Music Listening Areas			
Extremely and Very Interested	37%	43%	50%
Not at all interested	46%	37%	32%
People to help improve reading skills			
Extremely and Very Interested	33%	38%	43%
Not at all interested	49%	43%	36%
People to provide information over the phone			
Extremely and Very Interested	41%	54%	60%
Not at all interested	32%	19%	14%

About Funding—Where Does the Average American Think Most of the Money Comes From to Support the Public Library?

What About Potential Sources of Additional Funding?

More than half of the respondents either did not know, or gave an incorrect response to the first question. Specifically, one in five said he or she did not know the answer to the question. Eleven percent guessed that the federal government provided most of the money for the support of public libraries, and 29 percent named the state government. Forty-four percent of the respondents correctly said the local government provided most of the funding for public libraries.

All respondents were asked: "Now let's suppose that your local library needs additional funds to continue operation. Please tell us if you would favor any of the following as possible solutions".

Would You Favor:	Yes	No	Don't Know
Taxes being increased to cover the necessary cost	43%	50%	7%
The library charging people who use it	51%	44%	6%
The library reducing the services it offers the public	13%	78%	9%

12

Do T[illegible] ...ary With Your Children?

Do [illegible] Youngest Child?

Overall, [illegible] parents accompany children to the public library; women are much more likely to make these visits than men. On the other hand, 47 percent do not go to the library with their children. The more often the parent visits the library, the more likely he or she is to visit with a child. Sixty-six percent of all Americans who have visited the library in the past year have made a visit with their children.

About two out of five (38%) of the respondents with children under seven read to that child every day. Another 19 percent read "more than once a week". On the other hand, 10 percent say they never read to their children. Forty-seven percent of the female respondents say they read almost every day, and half of the "heavy readers" also say they read to their young children almost every day.

What Does the Average Parent Think of His or Her Oldest Child's Reading Level?

All respondents were asked whether they believed their oldest child was reading at, above or below his or her grade level.

Almost half of the responding parents said their children were reading above school grade level. About one in three said their oldest child was reading at school grade level, and 13 percent said that child was reading below grade level.

Almost all parents said they felt the school library was important for their child's education, about three-fourths said the school library was frequently used by their oldest child. Over half said the library was equipped with films, tapes and records. But almost a third did not know about the availability of non-print media, and nearly one out of five said the school library was not used frequently by their oldest child.

What is the Average American's Perception of the Effect of Television on Reading?

Most Americans are not convinced that watching less television would have an impact on their reading, nor are they altogether convinced it would affect their children's reading.

Almost half of the respondents said they felt that if they watched less television they would read about the same amount they are reading now, and 46 percent with children under 18 said they felt their children would also maintain about the same reading level, even with less television.

On the other hand 43 percent said they would read more, and 53 percent of parents between the ages of 35 and 49 said they felt less television would increase their children's reading.

The figures do not constitute an overwhelming indictment of television as a reading inhibitor.

14

How Many Books Does the Average American Read, and What Types of Books are These?

More than half of all the respondents read a book in the last month (58%), and 71 percent of all people who have visited a library in the last year have read all or part of a book in the last month. Overall, more than three-fourths of all the respondents (77%) said they had read all or part of a book in the last year.

Fiction is the most popular, and most people are reading it in paperback form. About one out of four people (26%) read a book in the past year because of something they saw on television. This book was most likely to be a work of fiction that had been serialized, although books that had been advertised or mentioned on television talk shows were also cited by the respondents.

Almost one out of three people got the last book they read from a friend or relative, 12 percent got the book most recently read at the public library, 24 percent at a bookstore.

The profile of the heavy reader (21 books or more in the past year) is typically:

- female
- 18-34 years of age
- college educated

The profile of the non-reader is typically:

- male
- 35 years of age and older
- high school education or less
- no children living in the household
- living in the Midwest

Overall, better than one in four of the respondents (27%) has read 21 or more books in the past year, and 13% have read more than 50 books.

Number of books read in past year	Any library visitor	Non visitors
1-5 books	25%	37%
6-10 books	17%	15%
11-20 books	18%	13%
21-50 books	18%	8%
50 and over	16%	10%

15

One of ALA's 1975 National Library Week Graphics

[16] Shaped as much by those who use them... as by those who serve in them... American libraries will continue to be a mirror of our society's achievements as well as its potential.

All national projections are from the 1978 Gallup study "Book Reading and Library Usage". All or part of the material in this brochure may be reprinted with appropriate credit. Copies of the complete (120 pages) study can be obtained from the ALA: $15.00 to ALA members; $25 to non-members. Checks must accompany orders.

Produced by:
Public Information Office
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Photographs: Arthur Rickerby
Designed by: Associates/A.G. Van de Wetering, Carl Bellmyer

Mr. FORD. Do you have further comments?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I agree that the booklet ought to be put in the record.

Chairman PERKINS. Not the pictures though.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am kind of fascinated really by a picture—the pages are not numbered, it must be page 2—of a magazine rack that I take it is in one of the libraries, which I think goes far towards furthering the education. It shows some of the magazines that are present in the library—such as Kiss, Backstage, National Lampoon and what looks like maybe Playboy or Penthouse—but nonetheless I think we ought to include it in the record. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman for calling——

Mr. EDWARDS. He had a vivid imagination. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHANK. Without prejudice, may I say those titles were selected very carefully and were not there at random.

Mr. FORD. I think it perhaps appropriate that in making a selection of the materials available, that you tailor it to the probably wide range of tastes you would find in a body as diverse as the U.S. House of Representatives. [Laughter.]

Thank you very much.

We appreciate your assistance and the committee will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m. the committee meeting was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○